arXiv:1109.4542v1 [math.AP] 21 Sep 2011

ON THERMODYNAMICALLY CONSISTENT STEFAN PROBLEMS WITH VARIABLE SURFACE ENERGY

JAN PRÜSS, GIERI SIMONETT, AND MATHIAS WILKE

Abstract. A thermodynamically consistent two-phase Stefan problem with temperature-dependent surface tension and with or without kinetic undercooling is studied. It is shown that these problems generate local semiflows in well-defined state manifolds. If a solution does not exhibit singularities, it is proved that it exists globally in time and converges towards an equilibrium of the problem. In addition, stability and instability of equilibria is studied. In particular, it is shown that multiple spheres of the same radius are unstable if surface heat capacity is small; however, if kinetic undercooling is absent, they are stable if surface heat capacity is sufficiently large.

1. Introduction

In the recent paper [18] the authors studied Stefan problems with surface tension and with or without kinetic undercooling which are consistent with thermodynamics, in the sense that the total energy is preserved and the total entropy is strictly increasing along nonconstant smooth solutions.

1. To formulate this problem, let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain of class C^2, $n \geq 2$. Ω is occupied by a material that can undergo phase changes: at time t, phase i occupies the subdomain $\Omega_i(t)$ of Ω, respectively, with $i = 1, 2$. We assume that $\partial\Omega_1(t) \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$; this means that no *boundary contact* can occur. The closed compact hypersurface $\Gamma(t) := \partial\Omega_1(t) \subset \Omega$ forms the interface between the phases.

The problem consists in finding a family of closed compact hypersurfaces $\Gamma(t)$ contained in Ω and an appropriately smooth function $u : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \bar{\Omega} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} \kappa(u)\partial_t u - \operatorname{div}(d(u)\nabla u) &= 0 && \text{in} && \Omega \setminus \Gamma(t) \\ \partial_\nu u &= 0 && \text{on} && \partial\Omega \\ [\![u]\!] &= 0 && \text{on} && \Gamma(t) \\ [\![\psi(u)]\!] + \sigma\mathcal{H} &= \gamma(u)V && \text{on} && \Gamma(t) \\ [\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!] &= (l(u) - \gamma(u)V)V && \text{on} && \Gamma(t) \\ u(0) &= u_0 && \text{in} && \Omega, \\ \Gamma(0) &= \Gamma_0. \end{aligned}\right. \tag{1.1}$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35R35, 35B35, 35K55; Secondary: 80A22.

Key words and phrases. Phase transition, free boundary problem, Gibbs-Thomson law, kinetic undercooling, variable surface tension, surface energy, surface diffusion, stability, instability.

Here $u(t)$ denotes the (absolute) temperature, $\nu(t)$ the outer normal field of $\Omega_1(t)$, $V(t)$ the normal velocity of $\Gamma(t)$, $\mathcal{H}(t) = \mathcal{H}(\Gamma(t)) = -\mathrm{div}_{\Gamma(t)}\nu(t)$ the sum of the principal curvatures, and $[\![v]\!] = v_2|_{\Gamma(t)} - v_1|_{\Gamma(t)}$ the jump of a function v across $\Gamma(t)$. Since u means absolute temperature we always assume that $u > 0$.

Several quantities are derived from the free energies $\psi_i(u)$ as follows:

- $\epsilon_i(u) := \psi_i(u) + u\eta_i(u)$ denotes the internal energy in phase i,
- $\eta_i(u) := -\psi_i'(u)$ the entropy,
- $\kappa_i(u) := \epsilon_i'(u) = -u\psi_i''(u)$ the heat capacity,
- $l(u) := u[\![\psi'(u)]\!] = -u[\![\eta(u)]\!]$ the latent heat.

Furthermore, $d_i(u) > 0$ denotes the coefficient of heat conduction in Fourier's law, $\gamma(u) \geq 0$ the coefficient of kinetic undercooling, and $\sigma > 0$ the coefficient of surface tension. In the sequel we drop the index i, as there is no danger of confusion; we just keep in mind that the coefficients in the bulk depend on the phases.

The temperature is assumed to be continuous across the interface. However, the free energy and the conductivities depend on the respective phases, and hence the jumps $\varphi(u) := [\![\psi(u)]\!]$, $[\![\kappa(u)]\!]$, $[\![\eta(u)]\!]$, $[\![d(u)]\!]$ are in general non-zero at the interface. Throughout we require that the heat capacities $\kappa_i(u)$ and diffusivities $d_i(u)$ are strictly positive over the whole temperature range $u > 0$, and that φ has exactly one zero $u_m > 0$ called the *melting temperature*.

If we assume that the coefficient of surface tension σ is constant, then this model is consistent with the laws of thermodynamics. In fact, the total energy of the system is given by

$$\mathsf{E}(u,\Gamma) = \int_{\Omega\setminus\Gamma} \epsilon(u)\,dx + \int_\Gamma \sigma\,ds, \tag{1.2}$$

and by the transport and surface transport theorem we have for smooth solutions

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\mathsf{E}(u(t),\Gamma(t)) &= -\int_\Gamma \{[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!] + [\![\epsilon(u)]\!]V + \sigma\mathcal{H}V\}\,ds \\ &= -\int_\Gamma \{[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!] - (l(u) - \gamma(u)V))V\}\,ds = 0,\end{aligned}$$

and thus, energy is conserved. Also the total entropy $\Phi(u,\Gamma)$ defined by

$$\Phi(u,\Gamma) = \int_{\Omega\setminus\Gamma} \eta(u)\,dx \tag{1.3}$$

is nondecreasing along smooth solutions, as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(u(t),\Gamma(t)) &= \int_\Omega \frac{1}{u^2}d(u)|\nabla u|^2\,dx - \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{u}\{[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!] + u[\![\eta(u)]\!]V\}\,ds \\ &= \int_\Omega \frac{1}{u^2}d(u)|\nabla u|^2\,dx + \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{u}\gamma(u)V^2\,ds \geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

2. In this paper we consider the physically important case where surface tension $\sigma = \sigma(u)$ is a function of surface temperature u. Then, following [9] and [1], the surface energy will be $\int_\Gamma \epsilon_\Gamma(u)\,ds$ instead of $\int_\Gamma \sigma\,ds$, where $\epsilon_\Gamma(u)$ denotes the density of surface energy. In addition, one has to take into account the total surface entropy $\int_\Gamma \eta_\Gamma(u)\,ds$, as well as balance of surface energy. The latter means that the Stefan law has to be replaced by a dynamic equation on the moving interface $\Gamma(t)$ of the form

$$\kappa_\Gamma(u)\partial_{t,n}u - \mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u)\nabla_\Gamma u) = [\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!] - \big(l(u) - \gamma(u)V + l_\Gamma(u)\mathcal{H}\big)V,$$

where $\partial_{t,n}$ denotes the time derivative in normal direction, see (1.7). As in the bulk we define on the interface

- $\epsilon_\Gamma(u) := \sigma(u) + u\eta_\Gamma(u)$ denotes the surface internal energy,
- $\eta_\Gamma(u) := -\sigma'(u)$ the surface entropy,
- $\kappa_\Gamma(u) := \epsilon_\Gamma'(u) = -u\sigma''(u)$ the surface heat capacity,
- $l_\Gamma(u) := u\sigma'(u) = -u\eta_\Gamma(u)$ the surface latent heat.

We also employ a Fourier law on the interface to describe surface heat conduction, i.e. we set $q_\Gamma := -d_\Gamma(u)\nabla_\Gamma u$, which should be present as soon as the interface has heat capacity. Recall that u is assumed to be continuous across the interface, hence the surface temperature

$$u_\Gamma := u_{|_\Gamma} \tag{1.4}$$

is well-defined.

Obviously, if σ is constant then $\epsilon_\Gamma = \sigma$, and $\eta_\Gamma = \kappa_\Gamma = l_\Gamma = 0$, hence this model reduces to (1.1). On the other hand, if σ is linear in u we still have $\kappa_\Gamma = 0$ and then it makes sense to also set $d_\Gamma \equiv 0$, to obtain the modified Stefan law

$$[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!] = \big(l(u) - \gamma(u)V + l_\Gamma(u)\mathcal{H}\big)V,$$

which differs from the Stefan law in (1.1) only by replacing $l(u)$ by $l(u) + l_\Gamma(u)\mathcal{H}$. This is just a minor modification of (1.1), and its analysis remains essentially the same as in [18]. The only difference is that the stability condition for the equilibria, and in case $\gamma \equiv 0$ also the well-posedness condition, changes. More precisely, the well-posedness condition changes from $\varphi' \neq 0$ to $\lambda' \neq 0$ where $\lambda(s) := \varphi(s)/\sigma(s)$, and the stability condition modifies by replacing φ'/σ by λ'.

Therefore we concentrate here on the case where $\kappa_\Gamma(u), d_\Gamma(u) > 0$, which means that σ is strictly concave. It has been shown experimentally that positive surface heat capacity κ_Γ is important in certain practical situations; see [2] for recent work in this direction. Experimental evidence also show that σ is strictly decreasing, hence admits exactly one zero $u_c > 0$; $\sigma(u)$ is positive in $(0, u_c)$ and negative for $u > u_c$. Physically, it is reasonable to assume $u_c > u_m$. It turns out that the analysis of the problem with nonlinear surface tension is considerably different from the linear case. In the sequel we always assume that

$$d_i, \psi_i, d_\Gamma, \sigma, \gamma \in C^3(0, u_c), \quad d_i, \kappa_i, d_\Gamma, \kappa_\Gamma, \sigma > 0 \ \text{ on } \ (0, u_c), \quad i = 1, 2, \tag{1.5}$$

if not stated otherwise. Further, we let $\gamma \equiv 0$ if there is no undercooling, or $\gamma > 0$ on $(0, u_c)$ if undercooling is present, and we restrict our attention to the temperature range $u \in (0, u_c)$.

With these restrictions on the parameter functions, we consider the following problem:

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} \kappa(u)\partial_t u - \mathrm{div}(d(u)\nabla u) &= 0 && \text{in} && \Omega\setminus\Gamma(t)\\ \partial_\nu u &= 0 && \text{on} && \partial\Omega\\ [\![u]\!] = 0, \quad u_\Gamma &= u && \text{on} && \Gamma(t)\\ \varphi(u_\Gamma) + \sigma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H} &= \gamma(u_\Gamma)V && \text{on} && \Gamma(t)\\ \kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\partial_{t,n}u_\Gamma - \mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma) &= \\ = [\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!] - (l(u_\Gamma) + l_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H} &- \gamma(u_\Gamma)V)V && \text{on} && \Gamma(t)\\ u(0) &= u_0 && \text{in} && \Omega,\\ \Gamma(0) &= \Gamma_0. \end{aligned}\right. \tag{1.6}$$

Here $\varphi(u) = [\![\psi(u)]\!]$, and $\partial_{t,n}u_\Gamma$ denotes the time derivative of u_Γ in normal direction, defined by

$$\partial_{t,n}u_\Gamma(t,p) := \frac{d}{d\tau}u_\Gamma(t+\tau, x(t+\tau,p))\big|_{\tau=0}, \quad t>0, \quad p\in\Gamma(t), \tag{1.7}$$

with $\{x(t+\tau,p)\in\mathbb{R}^n : (\tau,p)\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)\times\Gamma(t)\}$ the flow induced by the normal vector field $(V\nu)$. That is, $[\tau\mapsto x(t+\tau,p)]$ defines for each $p\in\Gamma(t)$ a flow line through p with

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}x(t+\tau,p) = (V\nu)(t+\tau, x(t+\tau,p)), \quad x(t+\tau,p)\in\Gamma(t+\tau), \quad \tau\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon),$$

and $x(t,p)=p$. The existence of a unique trajectory

$$\{x(t+\tau,p)\in\mathbb{R}^n : \tau\in(-\varepsilon,\varepsilon)\}, \quad \in\Gamma(t),$$

with the above properties is not completely obvious, see for instance [12] for a proof.

Note that the (non-degenerate) equilibria for this problem are the same as those for (1.1): the temperature is constant, and the disperse phase Ω_1 consists of finitely many nonintersecting balls of the same radius. We shall prove that such an equilibrium is stable in the state manifold $\mathcal{SM}$ defined below if Ω_1 is connected and the stability condition introduced in the next section holds. Such an equilibrium will be a local maximum of the total entropy, as we found before in [18] for the case of constant surface tension. To the best of our knowledge, there is no mathematical work on thermodynamically consistent Stefan problems with surface tension depending on the temperature.

3. The case where undercooling is present is the simpler one, as both equations on the interface are dynamic equations. In particular, the Gibbs-Thomson identity

$$\gamma(u_\Gamma)V - \sigma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H} = \varphi(u_\Gamma)$$

can be understood as a **mean curvature flow** for the evolution of the surface, modified by physics.

If there is no undercooling, it is convenient to eliminate the time derivative of u_Γ from the energy balance on the interface. In fact, differentiating the Gibbs-Thomson law w.r.t. time t and, with $\lambda(s) = \varphi(s)/\sigma(s)$, we obtain

$$\lambda'(u_\Gamma)\partial_{t,n}u_\Gamma + \mathcal{H}'(\Gamma)V = 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma(t),$$

hence substitution into surface energy balance yields with

$$T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) := \omega_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) - \mathcal{H}'(\Gamma),\ \omega_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) := \lambda'(u_\Gamma)(l(u_\Gamma) - l_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\lambda(u_\Gamma))/\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma),$$

the relation

$$T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)V = \frac{\lambda'(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\big\{\mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma) + [\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!]\big\}. \tag{1.8}$$

As V should be determined only by the state of the system and should not depend on time derivatives of other variables, this indicates that the problem without undercooling is not well-posed if the operator $T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)$ is not invertible in $L_2(\Gamma)$, as V might not be well-defined. On the other hand if $T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)$ is invertible, then

$$V = [T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)]^{-1}\frac{\lambda'(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\Big\{\mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma) + [\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!]\Big\} \tag{1.9}$$

uniquely determines the interfacial velocity V, gaining two derivatives in space, and showing that the right hand side of surface energy balance is of lower order. Note that

$$\omega_\Gamma(s) = s\sigma(s)[\lambda'(s)]^2/\kappa_\Gamma(s) \geq 0 \quad \text{in } (0, u_c), \tag{1.10}$$

and $\omega_\Gamma(s) = 0$ if and only if $\lambda'(s) = 0$. Therefore the well-posedness condition becomes more complex compared to the case $\kappa_\Gamma \equiv 0$.

Going one step further, taking the surface gradient of the Gibbs-Thomson relation yields the identity

$$\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)V - d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma) = \kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\{f_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) + F_\Gamma(u, u_\Gamma)\}, \tag{1.11}$$

as will be shown in Section 6. Here the function f_Γ is the antiderivative of $\lambda(d_\Gamma/\kappa_\Gamma)'$ vanishing at $s = u_m$, and F_Γ is nonlocal in space and of lower order. So also in the case where undercooling is absent we obtain a **mean curvature flow**, modified by physics.

We would like to point out a phenomenon, in absence of kinetic undercooling, which is due to positive surface heat capacity κ_Γ. If κ_Γ at an equilibrium is large enough, then such a steady state is stable, even if the interface is disconnected! Hence, this case seems to prevent the onset of Ostwald ripening. However, as we shall see in the next section, such equilibria cannot be maxima of the total entropy.

The plan for this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we discuss some fundamental physical properties of the Stefan problem with variable surface tension. In particular, it is shown that the negative total entropy is a strict Lyapunov functional for the problem, and we characterize and analyze the equiliria of the system. The direct mapping method based on the Hanzawa transform, first introduced in [8], is discussed in Section 3. This way the problem is reduced to a quasilinear parabolic problem. In Section 4 we consider the full linearization of the problem at a given equilibrium, and we prove that these are normally hyperbolic, generically. The last two sections deal with the analysis of the nonlinear problem with and without kinetic undercooling. The analysis is based on results for abstract quasilinear parabolic problems, in particular on the generalized principle of linearized stability, see [10, 17]. We refer here to [3, 13, 15] for information on maximal regularity in L_p- and weighted L_p- spaces, and to [5, 6, 7, 18] for more background information concerning the Stefan problem.

2. ENERGY, ENTROPY AND EQUILIBRIA

(a) The total energy of the system (1.6) is given by

$$\mathsf{E}(u,\Gamma)=\int_{\Omega\setminus\Gamma}\epsilon(u)\,dx+\int_\Gamma \epsilon_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\,ds, \tag{2.1}$$

and by the transport and surface transport theorem we have for smooth solutions

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\mathsf{E}(u,\Gamma)&=\int_\Omega \kappa(u)\partial_t u\,dx-\int_\Gamma [\![\epsilon(u)]\!]V\,ds+\int_\Gamma\{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\partial_{t,n}u_\Gamma-\epsilon_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}V\}\,ds\\
&=\int_\Gamma\{-[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!]-[\![\epsilon(u)]\!]V+\mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma)\\
&\qquad+[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!]-(l(u)+l_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H})V+\gamma(u_\Gamma)V^2-\epsilon_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}V\}\,ds\\
&=-\int_\Gamma\{[\![\psi(u)]\!]+\sigma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}-\gamma(u_\Gamma)V\}V\,ds=0\end{aligned}$$

by the Gibbs-Thomson law, and thus, energy is conserved.

(b) The total entropy of the system, given by

$$\Phi(u,\Gamma)=\int_{\Omega\setminus\Gamma}\eta(u)\,dx+\int_\Gamma\eta_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\,ds, \tag{2.2}$$

satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(u,\Gamma)&=\int_\Omega\eta'(u)\partial_t u\,dx+\int_\Gamma\{\partial_{t,n}\eta_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)-([\![\eta(u)]\!]+\eta_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H})V\}\,ds\\
&=\int_\Omega\frac{1}{u}\kappa(u)\partial_t u\,dx+\int_\Gamma\frac{1}{u_\Gamma}\{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\partial_{t,n}u_\Gamma+(l(u)+l_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H})V\}\,ds\\
&=\int_\Omega\frac{1}{u^2}d(u)|\nabla u|^2\,dx\\
&\quad+\int_\Gamma\frac{1}{u_\Gamma}\{-[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!]+\mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma)+[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!]+\gamma(u_\Gamma)V^2\}\,ds\\
&=\int_\Omega\frac{1}{u^2}d(u)|\nabla u|^2\,dx+\int_\Gamma\frac{1}{u_\Gamma^2}\{d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)|\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma|^2+u_\Gamma\gamma(u_\Gamma)V^2\}\,ds\ge 0,\end{aligned}$$

where we employed the transport theorem, the surface transport theorem and (1.6). In particular, the negative total entropy is a Lyapunov functional for problem (1.6).

(c) Even more, $-\Phi$ is a strict Lyapunov functional in the sense that it is strictly decreasing along smooth solutions which are non-constant in time. Indeed, if at some time $t_0 \geq 0$ we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Phi(u(t_0), \Gamma(t_0)) = 0,$$

then

$$\int_\Omega \frac{1}{u^2} d(u)|\nabla u|^2\, dx + \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{u_\Gamma^2} d(u)|\nabla u_\Gamma|^2\, ds + \int_\Gamma \frac{1}{u_\Gamma}\gamma(u_\Gamma)V^2\, ds = 0,$$

hence $\nabla u(t_0) = 0$ in Ω and $\gamma(u_\Gamma(t_0))V(t_0) = 0$ on $\Gamma(t_0)$. This implies $u(t_0) = \mathit{const} = u_\Gamma(t_0)$ in Ω, and $\mathcal{H}(t_0) = -[\![\psi(u(t_0))]\!]/\sigma(u_\Gamma(t_0)) = \mathit{const}$, provided we have

$$[\![\psi(s)]\!] = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sigma(s) > 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Physically, this assumption is plausible, as it means that at melting temperature $u_m > 0$ (defined as the *unique* positive zero of the function $\varphi(s) := [\![\psi(s)]\!]$) the surface tension $\sigma(u_m)$ is positive. Since Ω is bounded, we may conclude that $\Gamma(t_0)$ is a union of finitely many, say m, disjoint spheres of equal radius, i.e. $(u(t_0), \Gamma(t_0))$ is an equilibrium. Therefore, the *limit sets* of solutions in the state manifold defined below are contained in the $(mn+1)$- dimensional manifold of equilibria

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E} = \big\{\big(u_*, \bigcup_{1\leq l\leq m} S_{R_*}(x_l)\big) : 0 < u_* < u_c,\ [\![\psi(u_*)]\!] = (n-1)\sigma(u_*)/R_*,\\ \bar{B}_{R_*}(x_l) \subset \Omega,\ \bar{B}_{R_*}(x_l) \cap \bar{B}_{R_*}(x_k) = \emptyset,\ k \neq l\big\},\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

where $S_{R_*}(x_l)$ denotes the sphere with radius R_* and center x_l.

(d) Another interesting observation is the following. Consider the critical points of the functional $\Phi(u, u_\Gamma, \Gamma)$ with constraint $\mathsf{E}(u, u_\Gamma, \Gamma) = \mathsf{E}_0$, say on

$$U := \{(u, u_\Gamma, \Gamma) :\ u \in C(\bar{\Omega} \setminus \Gamma),\ \ \Gamma \in \mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega),\ \ u_\Gamma \in C(\Gamma),\ \ u, u_\Gamma > 0\},$$

see below for the definition of $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$. So here we do not assume from the beginning that u is continuous across Γ, and u_Γ denotes surface temperature. Then by the method of Lagrange multipliers, there is $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ such that at a critical point $(u_*, u_{\Gamma *}, \Gamma_*)$ we have

$$\Phi'(u_*, u_{\Gamma*}, \Gamma_*) + \mu\mathsf{E}'(u_*, u_{\Gamma*}, \Gamma_*) = 0. \tag{2.5}$$

The derivatives of the functionals are given by

$$\langle \Phi'(u, u_\Gamma, \Gamma)|(v, v_\Gamma, h)\rangle = (\eta'(u)|v)_\Omega + (\eta_\Gamma'(u_\Gamma)|v_\Gamma)_\Gamma - ([\![\eta(u)]\!] + \eta_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)|h)_\Gamma,$$

and

$$\langle \mathsf{E}'(u, u_\Gamma, \Gamma)|(v, v_\Gamma, h)\rangle = (\epsilon'(u)|v)_\Omega + (\epsilon_\Gamma'(u_\Gamma)|v_\Gamma)_\Gamma - ([\![\epsilon(u)]\!] + \epsilon_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)|h)_\Gamma.$$

Setting first $v_\Gamma = h = 0$ and varying v in (2.5) we obtain

$$\eta'(u_*) + \mu\epsilon'(u_*) = 0 \quad \text{ in } \Omega,$$

varying v_Γ yields

$$\eta_\Gamma'(u_{\Gamma*}) + \mu\epsilon_\Gamma'(u_{\Gamma*}) = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_*,$$

and finally varying h we get

$$[\![\eta(u_*)]\!] + \eta_\Gamma(u_{\Gamma*})\mathcal{H}(\Gamma) + \mu([\![\epsilon(u_*)]\!] + \epsilon_\Gamma(u_{\Gamma*})\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_*)) = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_*.$$

The relations $\eta(u) = -\psi'(u)$ and $\epsilon(u) = \psi(u) - u\psi'(u)$ imply $0 = -\psi''(u_*)(1+\mu u_*)$, and this shows that $u_* = -1/\mu$ is constant in Ω, since $\kappa(u) = -u\psi''(u) > 0$ for all $u > 0$ by assumption. Similarly on Γ_* we obtain $u_{\Gamma*} = -1/\mu$ constant as well, provided $\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) > 0$, hence in particular $u_* \equiv u_{\Gamma*}$. This further implies the Gibbs-Thomson relation $[\![\psi(u_*)]\!] + \sigma(u_*)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_*) = 0$. Since u_* is constant we see that $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_*)$ is constant, by (2.3). Therefore Γ_* is a sphere whenever connected, and a union of finitely many disjoint spheres of equal size otherwise. Thus the critical points of the entropy functional for prescribed energy are precisely the equilibria of problem (1.6).

(e) Going further, suppose we have an equilibrium $e_* := (u_*, u_{\Gamma*}, \Gamma_*)$ where the total entropy has a local maximum w.r.t. the constraint $\mathsf{E} = \mathsf{E}_0$ constant. Then $\mathcal{D}_* := [\Phi + \mu\mathsf{E}]''(e_*)$ is negative semi-definite on the kernel of $\mathsf{E}'(e_*)$, where $\mu = -1/u_*$ is the fixed Lagrange multiplier found above. The kernel of $\mathsf{E}'(e)$ is given by the identity

$$(\kappa(u)|v)_\Omega + (\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)|v_\Gamma)_\Gamma - ([\![\epsilon(u)]\!] + \epsilon_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)|h)_\Gamma \, ds = 0,$$

which at equilibrium yields

$$(\kappa_*|v)_\Omega + (\kappa_{\Gamma*}|v_\Gamma)_\Gamma + u_*(l_*|h)_\Gamma = 0, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\kappa_* := \kappa(u_*)$, $\kappa_{\Gamma*} := \kappa_\Gamma(u_*)$ and

$$l_* := \frac{1}{u_*}\big\{l(u_*) + l_\Gamma(u_*)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_*)\big\} = [\![\psi'(u_*)]\!] + \sigma'(u_*)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_*). \tag{2.7}$$

On the other hand, a straightforward calculation yields with $z = (v, v_\Gamma, h)$

$$-\langle\mathcal{D}_* z|z\rangle = \frac{1}{u_*^2}\big[(\kappa_* v|v)_\Omega + (\kappa_{\Gamma*} v_\Gamma|v_\Gamma)_\Gamma - \sigma_* u_*(\mathcal{H}'(\Gamma_*)h|h)_\Gamma\big], \tag{2.8}$$

where $\kappa_{\Gamma*} = \kappa_\Gamma(u_*)$ and $\sigma_* = \sigma(u_*)$. As κ_* and $\kappa_{\Gamma*}$ are positive, we see that the form $\langle\mathcal{D}z|z\rangle$ is negative semi-definite as soon as $\mathcal{H}'(\Gamma_*)$ is negative semi-definite. We have

$$\mathcal{H}'(\Gamma_*) = (n-1)/R_*^2 + \Delta_*,$$

where Δ_* denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator on Γ_* and R_* means the radius of an equilibrium sphere. To derive necessary conditions for an equilibrium e_* to be a local maximum of entropy, we consider two cases.

1. Suppose that Γ_* is not connected, i.e. Γ_* is a finite union of spheres Γ_*^k. Set $v = v_\Gamma = 0$, and let $h = h_k$ be constant on Γ_*^k with $\sum_k h_k = 0$. Then the constraint (2.6) holds, and with ω_n the area of the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$

$$\langle\mathcal{D}z|z\rangle = (\sigma_* u_*)((n-1)/R_*^2)\omega_n R_*^{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^m h_k^2 > 0,$$

hence $\mathcal{D}$ cannot be negative semi-definite in this case, as $\sigma_* > 0$ by (2.3). Thus if e_* is an equilibrium with maximal total entropy, then Γ_* must be connected, and hence both phases are connected.

2. Assume that Γ_* is connected. With $h = -(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega - \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*|$, $v = v_\Gamma = u_* l_* |\Gamma_*|$ we see that $\mathcal{D}$ negative semi-definite on the kernel of $\mathsf{E}'(e_*)$ implies the condition

$$\zeta_* := \zeta(u_*) := \frac{(n-1)\sigma_*[(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*|]}{u_* l_*^2 R_*^2 |\Gamma_*|} \leq 1. \tag{2.9}$$

We will see below that connectedness of Γ_* and the *strong stability condition* $\zeta_* < 1$ are sufficient for stability of the equilibrium e_*.

We point out that the quantity ζ_* defined in (2.9) coincides with the analog quantity in [18, Defintion (1.11)] in case $\kappa_{\Gamma*} = 0$ and $\sigma =$ constant. (Note that $l_* = l(u_*)/u_*$ in this case, which differs from the definition of l_* in [18]).

(f) Summarizing, we have shown

- The total energy is constant along smooth solutions of (1.6).
- The negative total entropy is a strict Ljapunov functional for (1.6).
- The equilibria of (1.6) are precisely the critical points of the entropy functional with prescribed energy.
- If the entropy functional with prescribed energy has a local maximum at $e_* = (u_*, u_{\Gamma*}, \Gamma_*)$ then Γ_* is connected.
- If Γ_* is connected, a necessary condition for a critical point $(u_*, u_{\Gamma*}, \Gamma_*)$ to be a local maximum of the entropy functional with prescribed energy is inequality (2.9).

(g) Now let us look at the energy of an equilibrium as a function of temperature. Suppose we have an equilibrium (u, Γ) at a given energy level E_0, and assume that Γ consists of m disjoint spheres of radius R contained in Ω. Then

$$0 < R < R_m := \sup\{R > 0 : \Omega \text{ contains } m \text{ disjoint ball of radius } R\},$$

and with $\varphi(u) := [\![\psi(u)]\!]$ we have

$$0 = \varphi(u) + \sigma(u)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma) = \varphi(u) - (n-1)\sigma(u)/R,$$

and hence $R = R(u) = (n-1)\sigma(u)/\varphi(u)$. Further we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_e(u) := \mathsf{E}(u, \Gamma) &= \int_\Gamma \epsilon(u)\,dx + \int_\Gamma \epsilon_\Gamma(u)\,ds \\ &= \epsilon_2(u)|\Omega| - |\Omega_1|[\![\epsilon(u)]\!] + \epsilon_\Gamma(u)|\Gamma| \\ &= \epsilon_2(u)|\Omega| - (m\omega_n/n)R(u)^n[\![\epsilon(u)]\!] + m\omega_n R(u)^{n-1}\epsilon_\Gamma(u) \\ &= \epsilon_2(u)|\Omega| + c_{n,m}\Big[\frac{\sigma(u)^n}{\varphi(u)^{n-1}} - u\frac{d}{du}\frac{\sigma(u)^n}{\varphi(u)^{n-1}}\Big], \end{aligned}$$

where $c_{n,m} = m\omega_n(n-1)^{n-1}/n$. Thus we obtain for the total energy of an equilibrium

$$\mathsf{E}_e(u) = \delta(u) - u\delta'(u), \quad \delta(u) = |\Omega|\psi_2(u) + c_{n,m}\frac{\sigma(u)^n}{\varphi(u)^{n-1}}. \tag{2.10}$$

Consequently, the equilibrium temperature for an equilibrium, where Γ consists of m components, is the solution of the scalar problem

$$\mathsf{E}_0 = \mathsf{E}_e(u) = \delta(u) - u\delta'(u), \quad 0 < u < u_c, \quad 0 < \sigma(u)/\varphi(u) < R_m/(n-1).$$

Let us look at the derivative of the function $\mathsf{E}_e(u)$. A simple calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{E}_e'(u) &= -u\delta''(u) = -|\Omega|u\psi_2''(u) - c_{n,m}u\frac{d}{du}\big[n\,(\sigma/\varphi)^{n-1}\,\sigma' - (n-1)(\sigma/\varphi)^n\varphi'\big] \\ &= |\Omega|\kappa_2(u) - c_{n,m}u\big[n(\sigma/\varphi)^{n-1}\sigma'' - (n-1)(\sigma/\varphi)^n\varphi''\big] \\ &\quad - c_{n,m}n(n-1)(\sigma/\varphi)^{n-1}u\big[(\sigma')^2/\sigma - 2\sigma'\varphi'/\varphi + \sigma(\varphi')^2/\varphi^2\big] \\ &= |\Omega|\kappa_2(u) + |\Gamma|\kappa_\Gamma(u) - |\Omega_1|[\![\kappa(u)]\!] - (R^2|\Gamma|/(n-1)\sigma)u\big[\varphi' - \sigma'\varphi/\sigma\big]^2 \\ &= \big[(\kappa(u)|1)_\Omega + |\Gamma|\kappa_\Gamma(u)\big] - (R^2(u)|\Gamma|/(n-1)\sigma(u))u\big[\,[\![\psi'(u)]\!] + \sigma'(u)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)\big]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore the stability condition $\zeta(u) \le 1$ is equivalent to $\mathsf{E}_e'(u) \le 0$, an alternative interpretation to the one obtained above.

3. Transformation to a Fixed Interface

Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded domain with boundary $\partial\Omega$ of class C^2, and suppose $\Gamma \subset \Omega$ is a closed hypersurface of class C^2, i.e. a C^2-manifold which is the boundary of a bounded domain $\Omega_1 \subset \Omega$. We then set $\Omega_2 = \Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_1$. Note that while Ω_2 is connected, Ω_1 may be disconnected. However, Ω_1 consists of finitely many components only, as $\partial\Omega_1 = \Gamma$ by assumption is a manifold, at least of class C^2. Recall that the *second order bundle* of Γ is given by

$$\mathcal{N}^2\Gamma := \{(p, \nu_\Gamma(p), L_\Gamma(p)) :\, p \in \Gamma\}.$$

Note that the Weingarten map L_Γ (also called the shape operator, or the second fundamental tensor) is defined by

$$L_\Gamma(p) = -\nabla_\Gamma \nu_\Gamma(p), \quad p \in \Gamma,$$

where ∇_Γ denotes the surface gradient on Γ. The eigenvalues $\kappa_j(p)$ of $L_\Gamma(p)$ are the principal curvatures of Γ at $p \in \Gamma$, and we have $|L_\Gamma(p)| = \max_j |\kappa_j(p)|$. The *curvature* $\mathcal{H}_\Gamma(p)$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{H}_\Gamma(p) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \kappa_j(p) = \mathrm{tr} L_\Gamma(p) = -\mathrm{div}_\Gamma \nu_\Gamma(p),$$

where div_Γ means surface divergence. Recall also that the *Hausdorff distance* d_H between the two closed subsets $A, B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ is defined by

$$d_H(A, B) := \max\big\{\sup_{a\in A} \mathrm{dist}(a, B), \sup_{b\in B} \mathrm{dist}(b, A)\big\}.$$

Then we may approximate Γ by a real analytic hypersurface Σ (or merely $\Sigma \in C^3$), in the sense that the Hausdorff distance of the second order bundles of Γ and Σ is as small as we want. More precisely, for each $\eta > 0$ there is a real analytic closed hypersurface such that $d_H(\mathcal{N}^2\Sigma, \mathcal{N}^2\Gamma) \le \eta$. If $\eta > 0$ is small enough, then Σ bounds a domain Ω_1^Σ with $\overline{\Omega_1^\Sigma} \subset \Omega$, and we set $\Omega_2^\Sigma = \Omega \setminus \bar{\Omega}_1^\Sigma$.

It is well known that such a hypersurface Σ admits a tubular neighborhood, which means that there is $a > 0$ such that the map

$$\Lambda :\, \Sigma \times (-a, a) \to \mathbb{R}^n$$
$$\Lambda(p, r) := p + r\nu_\Sigma(p)$$

is a diffeomorphism from $\Sigma \times (-a, a)$ onto $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda)$. The inverse

$$\Lambda^{-1} : \mathcal{R}(\Lambda) \mapsto \Sigma \times (-a, a)$$

of this map is conveniently decomposed as

$$\Lambda^{-1}(x) = (\Pi_\Sigma(x), d_\Sigma(x)), \quad x \in \mathcal{R}(\Lambda).$$

Here $\Pi_\Sigma(x)$ means the nonlinear orthogonal projection of x to Σ and $d_\Sigma(x)$ the signed distance from x to Σ; so $|d_\Sigma(x)| = \mathrm{dist}(x, \Sigma)$ and $d_\Sigma(x) < 0$ iff $x \in \Omega_1^\Sigma$. In particular we have $\mathcal{R}(\Lambda) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n :\, \mathrm{dist}(x, \Sigma) < a\}$.

On the one hand, a is determined by the curvatures of Σ, i.e. we must have

$$0 < a < \min\big\{1/|\kappa_j(p)| : j = 1, \dots, n-1,\ p \in \Sigma\big\},$$

where $\kappa_j(p)$ mean the principal curvatures of Σ at $p \in \Sigma$. But on the other hand, a is also connected to the topology of Σ, which can be expressed as follows. Since Σ is a compact (smooth) manifold of dimension $n-1$ it satisfies a (interior and exterior) ball condition, which means that there is a radius $r_\Sigma > 0$ such that for each point $p \in \Sigma$ there are $x_j \in \Omega_j^\Sigma$, $j = 1, 2$, such that $B_{r_\Sigma}(x_j) \subset \Omega_j^\Sigma$, and $\bar{B}_{r_\Sigma}(x_j) \cap \Sigma = \{p\}$. Choosing r_Σ maximal, we then must also have $a < r_\Sigma$. In the sequel we fix

$$a = \frac{1}{2}\min\left\{r_\Sigma, \frac{1}{|\kappa_j(p)|},\, j = 1, \dots, n-1,\ p \in \Sigma\right\}.$$

For later use we note that the derivatives of $\Pi_\Sigma(x)$ and $d_\Sigma(x)$ are given by

$$\nabla d_\Sigma(x) = \nu_\Sigma(\Pi_\Sigma(x)), \quad \Pi_\Sigma'(x) = M_0(d_\Sigma(x), \Pi(x))P_\Sigma(\Pi_\Sigma(x))$$

for $|d_\Sigma(x)| < a$, where $P_\Sigma(p) = I - \nu_\Sigma(p) \otimes \nu_\Sigma(p)$ denotes the orthogonal projection onto the tangent space $T_p\Sigma$ of Σ at $p \in \Sigma$, and

$$M_0(r)(p) = (I - rL_\Sigma(p))^{-1}, \quad (r, p) \in (-a, a) \times \Sigma. \tag{3.1}$$

Note that

$$|M_0(r)(p)| \le 1/(1 - r|L_\Sigma(p)|) \le 2, \qquad \text{for all } (r, p) \in (-a, a) \times \Sigma.$$

Setting $\Gamma = \Gamma(t)$, we may use the map Λ to parameterize the unknown free boundary $\Gamma(t)$ over Σ by means of a height function $h(t, p)$ via

$$\Gamma(t) = \{p + h(t, p)\nu_\Sigma(p) : p \in \Sigma,\ t \ge 0\},$$

at least for small $|h|_\infty$. Extend this diffeomorphism to all of $\bar{\Omega}$ by means of

$$\Xi_h(t, x) = x + \chi(d_\Sigma(x)/a)h(t, \Pi_\Sigma(x))\nu_\Sigma(\Pi_\Sigma(x)) =: x + \xi_h(t, x).$$

Here χ denotes a suitable cut-off function. More precisely, $\chi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$, $0 \le \chi \le 1$, $\chi(r) = 1$ for $|r| < 1/3$, and $\chi(r) = 0$ for $|r| > 2/3$. Note that $\Xi_h(t,x) = x$ for $|d(x)| > 2a/3$, and

$$\Xi_h^{-1}(t,x) = x - h(t,x)\nu_\Sigma(x), \quad x \in \Sigma,$$

for $|h|_\infty$ sufficiently small.

Setting

$$v(t,x) = u(t, \Xi_\rho(t,x)) \quad \text{or} \quad u(t,x) = v(t, \Xi_\rho^{-1}(t,x))$$

we have this way transformed the time varying regions $\Omega \setminus \Gamma(t)$ to the fixed domain $\Omega \setminus \Sigma$. This is the direct mapping method, also called Hanzawa transformation.

By means of this transformation, we obtain the following transformed problem.

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} \kappa(v)\partial_t v + \mathcal{A}(v,\rho)v &= \kappa(v)\mathcal{R}(\rho)v && \text{in} \quad \Omega \setminus \Sigma \\ \partial_\nu v &= 0 && \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \\ [\![v]\!] = 0, \quad v_\Gamma &= v && \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ [\![\psi(v_\Gamma)]\!] + \sigma(v_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\rho) - \gamma(v_\Gamma)\beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho &= 0 && \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ \kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)\partial_t v_\Gamma + \mathcal{C}(v_\Gamma,\rho)v_\Gamma + \mathcal{B}(v,\rho)v &= \\ = -\{l(v_\Gamma) + l_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\rho) &- \gamma(v_\Gamma)\beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho\}\beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho && \text{on} \quad \Sigma \\ v(0) = v_0, \ \rho(0) &= \rho_0. \end{aligned}\right. \tag{3.2}$$

Here $\mathcal{A}(v,\rho)$, $\mathcal{B}(v,\rho)$ and $\mathcal{C}(v_\Gamma,\rho)$ denote the transformed versions of the operators of $-\mathrm{div}(d\nabla)$, $-[\![d\partial_\nu]\!]$, and $-\mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma\nabla_\Gamma)$, respectively. Moreover, $\mathcal{H}(\rho)$ means the mean curvature of Γ, $\beta(\rho) = (\nu_\Sigma|\nu_\Gamma(\rho))$, the term $\beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho$ represents the normal velocity V, and

$$\mathcal{R}(\rho)v = \partial_t v - \partial_t u \circ \Xi_\rho.$$

The system (3.2) is a quasi-linear parabolic problem on the domain Ω with fixed interface $\Sigma \subset \Omega$ with *dynamic boundary conditions*.

To elaborate on the structure of this problem in more detail, we calculate

$$D\Xi_\rho = I + D\xi_\rho, \qquad [D\Xi_\rho]^{-1} = I - [I + D\xi_\rho]^{-1}D\xi_\rho =: I - M_1(\rho)^{\mathsf{T}}.$$

where D deontes the derivative with respect to the space variables. Hence $D\xi_\rho = 0$ for $|d_\Sigma(x)| > 2a/3$ and

$$\begin{aligned} D\xi_\rho(t,x) = &\frac{1}{a}\chi'(d_\Sigma(x)/a)\rho(t,\Pi_\Sigma(x))\nu_\Sigma(\Pi_\Sigma(x)) \otimes \nu_\Sigma(\Pi_\Sigma(x)) \\ &+ \chi(d_\Sigma(x)/a)[\nu_\Sigma(\Pi_\Sigma(x)) \otimes M_0(d_\Sigma(x))\nabla_\Sigma\rho(t,\Pi_\Sigma(x))] \\ &- \chi(d_\Sigma(x)/a)\rho(t,\Pi_\Sigma(x))L_\Sigma(\Pi_\Sigma(x))M_0(d_\Sigma(x))P_\Sigma(\Pi_\Sigma(x)) \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \le |d_\Sigma(x)| \le 2a/3$. In particular, for $x \in \Sigma$ we have

$$D\xi_\rho(t,x) = \nu_\Sigma(x) \otimes \nabla_\Sigma\rho(t,x) - \rho(t,x)L_\Sigma(x)P_\Sigma(x),$$

and

$$[D\xi_\rho]^{\mathsf{T}}(t,x) = \nabla_\Sigma\rho(t,x) \otimes \nu_\Sigma(x) - \rho(t,x)L_\Sigma(x),$$

since $L_\Sigma(x)$ is symmetric and has range in $T_x\Sigma$. Therefore, $[I+D\xi_\rho]$ is boundedly invertible, if ρ and $\nabla_\Sigma\rho$ are sufficiently small, and

$$|[I+D\xi_\rho]^{-1}|\leq 2 \quad \text{for } \ |\rho|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{4(|\chi'|_\infty/a+2\max_j|\kappa_j|)}, \quad |\nabla_\Sigma\rho|_\infty\leq\frac{1}{8}.$$

Employing this notation we obtain

$$\nabla u\circ\Xi_\rho = ([D\Xi_\rho^{-1})]^{\mathsf T}\circ\Xi_\rho)\nabla v = [D\Xi_\rho]^{-1,\mathsf T}\nabla v =: (I-M_1(\rho))\nabla v,$$

and for a vector field $q=\bar q\circ\Xi_\rho$

$$(\nabla|\bar q)\circ\Xi_\rho = (([D\Xi_\rho^{-1}]^{\mathsf T}\circ\Xi_\rho)\nabla|q) = ([D\Xi_\rho]^{-1,\mathsf T}\nabla|q) = ((I-M_1(\rho))\nabla|q).$$

Further we have

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t u\circ\Xi_\rho &= \partial_t v - (\nabla u\circ\Xi_\rho|\partial_t\Xi_\rho) = \partial_t v - ((D\Xi_\rho^{-1}]^{\mathsf T}\circ\Xi_\rho)\nabla v|\partial_t\Xi_\rho)\\ &= \partial_t v - ([D\Xi_\rho]^{-1,\mathsf T}\nabla v|\partial_t\xi_\rho) = \partial_t v - (\nabla v|(I-M_1^{\mathsf T}(\rho))\partial_t\xi_\rho),\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\mathcal{R}(\rho)v = (\nabla v|(I-M_1^{\mathsf T}(\rho))\partial_t\xi_\rho).$$

The normal time derivative transforms as

$$\partial_{t,n}u_\Gamma\circ\Xi_\rho = \partial_t v_\Gamma + (\nabla_\Sigma v_\Gamma|\nu_\Sigma)V = \partial_t v_\Gamma,$$

as $\nabla_\Sigma v_\Gamma$ is perpendicular to ν_Σ.
With the Weingarten tensor $L_\Sigma = -\nabla_\Sigma\nu_\Sigma$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_\Gamma(\rho) &= \beta(\rho)(\nu_\Sigma-\alpha(\rho)), &\quad \alpha(\rho) &= M_0(\rho)\nabla_\Sigma\rho,\\ M_0(\rho) &= (I-\rho L_\Sigma)^{-1}, & \beta(\rho) &= (1+|\alpha(\rho)|^2)^{-1/2},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$V = (\partial_t\Xi_\rho|\nu_\Gamma) = (\nu_\Sigma|\nu_\Gamma(\rho))\partial_t\rho = \beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho.$$

For the mean curvature $\mathcal{H}(\rho)$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}(\rho) = \beta(\rho)\{\operatorname{tr}[M_0(\rho)(L_\Sigma+\nabla_\Sigma\alpha(\rho))] - \beta^2(\rho)(M_0(\rho)\alpha(\rho)|[\nabla_\Sigma\alpha(\rho)]\alpha(\rho))\},$$

an expression involving second order derivatives of ρ only linearly. More precisely,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}(\rho) &= \beta(\rho)\mathcal{G}(\rho):\nabla_\Sigma^2\rho + \beta(\rho)\mathcal{F}(\rho),\\ \mathcal{G}(\rho) &= M_0^2(\rho) - \beta^2(\rho)M_0(\rho)\nabla_\Sigma\rho\otimes M_0(\rho)\nabla_\Sigma\rho.\end{aligned}$$

Note that β as well as $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ only depend on ρ and $\nabla_\Sigma\rho$. The linearization of the curvature at $\rho=0$ is given by

$$\mathcal{H}'(0) = \operatorname{tr} L_\Sigma^2 + \Delta_\Sigma.$$

Here Δ_Σ denotes the Laplace-Beltrami operator on Σ. $\mathcal{B}(v,\rho)$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(v,\rho)v &= -[\![d(u)\partial_\nu u]\!]\circ\Xi_\rho = -([\![d(v)(I-M_1(\rho))\nabla v]\!]|\nu_\Gamma)\\ &= -\beta(\rho)([\![d(v)(I-M_1(\rho))\nabla v]\!]|\nu_\Sigma-\alpha(\rho))\\ &= -\beta(\rho)[\![d(v)\partial_{\nu_\Sigma}v]\!] + \beta(\rho)([\![d(v)\nabla v]\!]|(I-M_1(\rho))^{\mathsf T}\alpha(\rho)),\end{aligned}$$

since $M_1^{\mathsf{T}}(\rho)\nu_\Sigma = 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}(v,\rho)v &= -\operatorname{div}(d(u)\nabla u)\circ\Xi_\rho = -((I-M_1(\rho))\nabla|d(v)(I-M_1(\rho))\nabla v)\\ &= -d(v)\Delta v + d(v)[M_1(\rho)+M_1^{\mathsf{T}}(\rho)-M_1(\rho)M_1^{\mathsf{T}}(\rho)] : \nabla^2 v\\ &\quad - d'(v)|(I-M_1(\rho))\nabla v|^2 + d(v)((I-M_1(\rho)) : \nabla M_1(\rho)|\nabla v).\end{aligned}$$

We recall that for matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$, $A : B = \sum_{i,j=1}^n a_{ij}b_{ij} = \operatorname{tr}(AB^{\mathsf{T}})$ denotes their inner product. The pull back of ∇_Γ is given by

$$\nabla_\Gamma\varphi\circ\Xi_\rho = P_\Gamma(\rho)M_0(\rho)\nabla_\Sigma\varphi,$$

where

$$P_\Gamma(\rho) = I - \nu_\Gamma(\rho)\otimes\nu_\Gamma(\rho).$$

This implies for $\mathcal{C}(v_\Gamma,\rho)v_\Gamma$ the relation

$$\mathcal{C}(v_\Gamma,\rho)v_\Gamma = -\operatorname{tr}\{P_\Gamma(\rho)M_0(\rho)\nabla_\Sigma\big(d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)P_\Gamma(\rho)M_0(\rho)\nabla_\Sigma v_\Gamma\big)\}.$$

It is easy to see that the leading part of $\mathcal{A}(v,\rho)v$ is $-d(v)\Delta v$, while that of $\mathcal{B}(v,\rho)v$ is $-\beta(\rho)[\![d(v)\partial_{\nu_\Sigma}v]\!]$, and the leading part of $\mathcal{C}(v_\Gamma,\rho)v_\Gamma$ turns out to be $-d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)\Delta_\Sigma$. This follows from $M_0(0)=1$, $P_\Gamma(0)=P_\Sigma$, $M_1(0)=0$ and $\alpha(0)=0$; recall that we may assume ρ small in the C^2-norm. It is important to recognize the quasilinear structure of (3.2).

4. Linearization at Equilibria

The full linearization at an equilibrium $(u_*, u_{\Gamma*}, \Gamma_*)$ with $u_{\Gamma*} = u_*$, $\Gamma_* = \cup_k\Sigma_k$ a finite union of disjoint spheres contained in Ω and with radius $R_* > 0$ given by $R_* = (n-1)\sigma(u_*)/[\![\psi(u_*)]\!]$, reads

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} \kappa_*\partial_t v - d_*\Delta v &= \kappa_* f && \text{in} \quad \Omega\setminus\Gamma_*\\ \partial_\nu v &= 0 && \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega\\ [\![v]\!] = 0, v_\Gamma &= v && \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*\\ \kappa_{\Gamma*}\partial_t v_\Gamma - d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* v_\Gamma - [\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!] + l_*u_*\partial_t\rho &= \kappa_{\Gamma*}f_\Gamma && \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*\\ l_*v_\Gamma - \sigma_*A_*\rho - \gamma_*\partial_t\rho &= g && \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*\\ v(0) = v_0,\ \rho(0) &= \rho_0. \end{aligned}\right. \tag{4.1}$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} &\kappa_* = \kappa(u_*) > 0, && \kappa_{\Gamma*} = \kappa_\Gamma(u_*) > 0, \quad d_* = d(u_*) > 0,\\ &d_{\Gamma*} = d_\Gamma(u_*) > 0, && \sigma_* = \sigma(u_*) > 0, \quad \gamma_* = \gamma(u_*) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

and as in (2.7)

$$l_* = [\![\psi'(u_*)]\!] + \sigma'(u_*)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_*) = \varphi'(u_*) - \sigma'(u_*)\varphi(u_*)/\sigma(u_*) = \sigma(u_*)\lambda'(u_*),$$

and

$$A_* = -(\frac{n-1}{R_*^2} + \Delta_*),$$

where Δ_* denotes the *Laplace-Beltrami* operator on Γ_*.

4.1. **Maximal Regularity.** We begin with the case $\gamma_*>0$, which is the simpler one. Define the operator L in

$$X_0 := L_p(\Omega)\times W^r_p(\Gamma_*)\times W^s_p(\Gamma_*)$$

with

$$X_1 := W^2_p(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_*)\times W^{2+r}_p(\Gamma_*)\times W^{2+s}_p(\Gamma_*)$$

by means of

$$D(L)=\big\{(v,v_\Gamma,\rho)\in X_1:\ [\![v]\!]=0,\ \ v_\Gamma=v \text{ on } \Gamma_*,\ \ \partial_\nu v=0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\big\},$$

$$L=\begin{bmatrix} (-d_*/\kappa_*)\Delta & 0 & 0\\ -[\![(d_*/\kappa_{\Gamma*})\partial_\nu]\!] & (l_*^2u_*/\gamma_*-d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_*)/\kappa_{\Gamma*} & -(l_*u_*\sigma_*/\gamma_*\kappa_{\Gamma*})A_*\\ 0 & -(l_*/\gamma_*) & (\sigma_*/\gamma_*)A_*\end{bmatrix}$$

In case $\gamma_*>0$, problem (4.1) is equivalent to the Cauchy problem

$$\dot z+Lz=(f,f_\Gamma-(l_*u_*/\gamma_*\kappa_{\Gamma*})g,g),\quad z(0)=z_0,$$

where $z=(v,v_\Gamma,\rho)$ and $z_0=(v_0,v_0|_{\Gamma_0},\rho_0)$. The main result on problem (4.1) for $\gamma_*>0$ is the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $1<p<\infty$, $\gamma_*>0$, and*

$$-1/p\le r\le 1-1/p,\quad r\le s\le r+2.$$

Then for each finite interval $J=[0,a]$, there is a unique solution

$$(v,v_\Gamma,\rho)\in\mathbb{E}(J):=H^1_p(J;X_0)\cap L_p(J;X_1)$$

of (4.1) *if and only if the data (f,f_Γ,g) and $(v_0,v_{\Gamma0},\rho_0)$ satisfy*

$$(f,f_\Gamma,g)\in\mathbb{F}(J)=L_p(J;X_0),$$
$$(v_0,v_{\Gamma0},\rho_0)\in W^{2-2/p}_p(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_*)\times W^{2+r-2/p}_p(\Gamma_*)\times W^{2+s-2/p}_p(\Gamma_*)$$

and the compatibility conditions

$$[\![v_0]\!]=0,\quad v_{\Gamma0}=v_0\quad\text{on}\quad\Gamma_*,\quad \partial_\nu v=0\quad\text{on}\quad\partial\Omega.$$

The operator $-L$ defined above generates an analytic C_0-semigroup in X_0 with maximal regularity of type L_p.

Proof. Looking at the entries of L we see that $L:X_1\to X_0$ is bounded provided $r\le 1-1/p$, $r\le s$, and $s\le r+2$. The compatibility condition $v_\Gamma=v_{|\Gamma_*}$ implies $r+2\ge 2-1/p$. This explains the constraints on the parameters r and s. To obtain maximal L_p-regularity, we first consider the case $s>r$. Then L is lower triangular up to perturbation. So we may solve the problem for (v,v_Γ) with maximal L_p-regularity (cf. [4] for the one-phase case) first and then that for ρ. In the other case we have $r=s$. Then the second term in the third line in the definition of L is of lower order, hence ρ decouples from (v,v_Γ). This way we also obtain maximal L_p-regularity. Since the Cauchy problem for L has maximal L_p-regularity, we can now infer from [14, Proposition 1.2] that $-L$ generates an analytic C_0-semigroup in X_0. □

We note that if $l_* = 0$ and $\gamma_* = 0$ then the linear problem (4.1) is not well-posed. In fact, in this case the linear Gibbs-Thomson relation reads

$$-\sigma_* A_* \rho = g,$$

which is not well-posed as the kernel of A_* is non-trivial and A_* is not surjective.

Now we consider the case $l_* \neq 0$ and $\gamma_* = 0$. For the solution space we fix again $r, s \in \mathbb{R}$ with $r \leq s \leq r+2$, $-1/p \leq r \leq 1-1/p$, and consider

$$(v, v_\Gamma, \rho) \in \mathbb{E}(J) = H^1_p(J, X_0) \cap L_p(J; X_1).$$

Then by trace theory the space of data becomes

$$\begin{aligned}(f, f_\Gamma, g) \in \mathbb{F}_0(J) := L_p(J; L_p(\Omega)) &\times L_p(J; W^r_p(\Gamma_*)) \\ &\times [H^1_p(J; W^{s-2}_p(\Gamma_*) \cap L_p(J; W^s_p(\Gamma_*))],\end{aligned}$$

and the space of initial values will be

$$(v_0, v_{\Gamma 0}, \rho_0) \in W^{2-2/p}_p(\Omega \setminus \Gamma_*) \times W^{r+2-2/p}_p(\Gamma_*) \times W^{s+3-2/p}_p(\Gamma_*)$$

with compatibilities

$$[\![v_0]\!] = 0, \quad v_{\Gamma 0} = v_0, \quad l_* v_{\Gamma 0} - \sigma_* A_* \rho_0 = g(0) \text{ on } \Gamma_*, \quad \partial_\nu v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

To obtain maximal L_p-regularity, we replace v_Γ by the Gibbs-Thomson relation, which for $\gamma_* = 0$ is an elliptic equation. We obtain $v_\Gamma = (\sigma_*/l_*)A_*\rho + g/l_*$. Inserting this expression into the energy balance on the surface Γ_* yields

$$\big(l_* u_* + (\kappa_{\Gamma *}\sigma_*/l_*)A_*\big)\partial_t \rho - d_{\Gamma *}\Delta_* v_\Gamma - [\![d_* \partial_\nu v]\!] = \kappa_{\Gamma *}(f_\Gamma - \partial_t g/l_*). \tag{4.2}$$

Moreover, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}d_{\Gamma *}\Delta_* v_\Gamma = (l_* u_* &+ (\kappa_{\Gamma *}\sigma_*/l_*)A_*))(d_{\Gamma *}/\kappa_{\Gamma *})\Delta_* \rho \\ &- (l_* u_* d_{\Gamma *}/\kappa_{\Gamma *})\Delta_* \rho + (d_{\Gamma *}/l_*)\Delta_* g.\end{aligned}$$

Now we assume that

$$u_* l_*^2 R_*^2 \neq (n-1)\kappa_{\Gamma *}\sigma_*, \tag{4.3}$$

which is equivalent to invertibility of the operator $A_0 := l_* u_* + (\kappa_{\Gamma *}\sigma_*/l_*)A_*$. Applying its inverse to (4.2) we arrive at the following equation for ρ:

$$\partial_t \rho - (d_{\Gamma *}/\kappa_{\Gamma *})\Delta_* \rho + A_0^{-1}\{(u_* l_* d_{\Gamma *}/\kappa_{\Gamma *})\Delta_* \rho - [\![d_* \partial_\nu v]\!]\} = \tilde{g}, \tag{4.4}$$

with

$$\tilde{g} = A_0^{-1}\big\{\kappa_{\Gamma *} f_\Gamma - ((\kappa_{\Gamma *}/l_*)\partial_t g - (d_{\Gamma *}/l_*)\Delta_* g)\big\}.$$

Solving equation (4.2) for $\partial_t \rho$ we obtain for v_Γ:

$$\kappa_{\Gamma *}\partial_t v_\Gamma - d_{\Gamma *}\Delta_* v_\Gamma - [\![d_* \partial_\nu v]\!] + l_* u_* A_0^{-1}\{d_{\Gamma *}\Delta_* v_\Gamma + [\![d_* \partial_\nu v]\!]\} = \tilde{f}_\Gamma. \tag{4.5}$$

where

$$\tilde{f}_\Gamma = \kappa_{\Gamma *}\{f_\Gamma - l_* u_* A_0^{-1}(f_\Gamma - \partial_t g/l_*)\}.$$

Then by the regularity of f_Γ and g and with $r \leq s \leq r+2$ we see that

$$\tilde{f}_\Gamma \in L_p(J; W^r_p(\Gamma_*)), \quad \tilde{g} \in L_p(J; W^s_p(\Gamma_*)).$$

So the linear problem (4.1) can be recast as an evolution equation in X_0 as

$$\dot z + L_0 z = (f, \tilde f_\Gamma, \tilde g), \quad z(0) = z_0,$$

with $L_0 = L_{00} + L_{01}$ defined by

$$D(L_{0j}) = \big\{(v, v_\Gamma, \rho) \in X_1 :\ [\![v]\!] = 0,\ \ v_\Gamma = v \text{ on } \Gamma_*,\ \ \partial_\nu v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\big\},$$

and

$$L_{00} = \begin{bmatrix} (-d_*/\kappa_*)\Delta & 0 & 0 \\ -[\![(d_*/\kappa_{\Gamma*})\partial_\nu]\!] & -(d_{\Gamma*}/\kappa_{\Gamma*})\Delta_* & 0 \\ -A_0^{-1}[\![d_*\partial_\nu]\!] & 0 & -(d_{\Gamma*}/\kappa_{\Gamma*})\Delta_* \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$L_{01} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ (l_* u_*/\kappa_{\Gamma*})A_0^{-1}[\![d_*\partial_\nu]\!] & (l_* u_* d_{\Gamma*}/\kappa_{\Gamma*})A_0^{-1}\Delta_* & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (u_* l_* d_{\Gamma*}/\kappa_{\Gamma*})A_0^{-1}\Delta_* \end{bmatrix}.$$

Looking at L_0 we first note that L_{01} is a lower order perturbation of L_{00}. The latter is lower triangular, and the problem for (v, v_Γ) as above has maximal L_p-regularity in X_0. As the diagonal entry in the equation for ρ has maximal L_p-regularity as well we may conclude that $-L_0$ generates an analytic C_0-semigroup with maximal regularity in X_0 More precisely, we have the following result.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $1 < p < \infty$, $\gamma_* = 0$, $-1/p \le r \le 1 - 1/p$, $r \le s \le r + 2$, $l_* \neq 0$, and assume $u_* l_*^2 R_*^2 \neq \kappa_{\Gamma*}\sigma_*(n-1)$.*

Then for each interval $J = [0, a]$, there is a unique solution $(v, v_\Gamma, \rho) \in \mathbb{E}(J)$ of (4.1) if and only if the data (f, f_Γ, g) and $(v_0, v_{\Gamma 0}, \rho_0)$ satisfy

$$(f, f_\Gamma, g) \in \mathbb{F}_0(J),$$
$$(v_0, v_{\Gamma 0}, \rho_0) \in W_p^{2-2/p}(\Omega \setminus \Gamma_*), \times W_p^{r+2-2/p}(\Gamma_*) \times W_p^{s+2-2/p}(\Gamma_*)$$

and the compatibility conditions

$$[\![v_0]\!] = 0, \quad v_{\Gamma 0} = v_0, \quad l_* v_0 - \sigma_* A_* \rho_0 = g(0) \text{ on } \Gamma_*, \quad \partial_\nu v = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega.$$

The operator $-L_0$ defined above generates an analytic C_0-semigroup in X_0 with maximal regularity of type L_p.

Note that the compatibility condition $l_* v_0 - \sigma_* A_* \rho_0 = g(0)$ allows to recover the Gibbs-Thomson relation from the dynamic equations. Indeed, it follows from (4.4)-(4.5) that the function $w := v_\Gamma - ((\sigma_*/l_*)A_*\rho + g/l_*)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa_{\Gamma*}\partial_t w - d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* w &= l_* u_* \big(\partial_t \rho - A_0^{-1}\{d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* v_\Gamma + [\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!] + \kappa_{\Gamma*}(f_\Gamma - \partial_t g/l_*)\}\big) \\ &= -l_* u_* A_0^{-1} d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* w, \end{aligned}$$

and this shows that w is a solution of the parabolic equation

$$\kappa_{\Gamma*}\partial_t w - d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* w + l_* u_* d_{\Gamma*} A_0^{-1}\Delta_* w = 0, \quad w(0) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*. \tag{4.6}$$

As $w \equiv 0$ is the unique solution of (4.6) we conclude that the Gibbs-Thomson relation is satisfied.

4.2. **The Eigenvalue Problem.** By compact embedding, the spectrum of L consists only of countably many discrete eigenvalues of finite multiplicity and is independent of p. Therefore it is enough to consider the case $p = 2$. In the following, we will use the notation

$$
\begin{aligned}
(u|v)_\Omega &:= (u|v)_{L_2(\Omega)} := \int_\Omega u\bar{v}\,dx, \quad u, v \in L_2(\Omega),\\
(g|h)_{\Gamma_*} &:= (g|h)_{L_2(\Gamma_*)} := \int_{\Gamma_*} g\bar{h}\,ds, \quad g, h \in L_2(\Gamma_*),
\end{aligned}
$$

for the L_2 inner product in Ω and Γ_*, respectively. Moreover, we set $|v|_\Omega = (v|v)_\Omega^{1/2}$ and $|g|_{\Gamma_*} = (g|g)_{\Gamma_*}^{1/2}$. The eigenvalue problem reads as follows:

$$
\left\{
\begin{aligned}
\kappa_*\lambda v - d_*\Delta v = 0 &\quad \text{in} \quad \Omega\setminus\Gamma_*\\
\partial_\nu v = 0 &\quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega\\
[\![v]\!] = 0 &\quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*\\
l_* v - \sigma_* A_*\rho - \gamma_*\lambda\rho = 0 &\quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*\\
\kappa_{\Gamma *}\lambda v - d_{\Gamma *}\Delta_* v - [\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!] + l_* u_*\lambda\rho = 0 &\quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*.
\end{aligned}
\right.
\tag{4.7}
$$

Let $\lambda \neq 0$ be an eigenvalue with eigenfunction $(v, \rho) \neq 0$. Then (4.7) yields

$$
0 = \lambda|\sqrt{\kappa_*}v|_\Omega^2 - (d_*\Delta v|v)_\Omega = \lambda|\sqrt{\kappa_*}v|_\Omega^2 + |\sqrt{d_*}\nabla v|_\Omega^2 + ([\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!]|v)_{\Gamma_*}.
$$

On the other hand, we have on the interface

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &= \kappa_{\Gamma *}\lambda|v|_{\Gamma_*}^2 - d_{\Gamma *}(\Delta_\Gamma v|v)_{\Gamma_*} - ([\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!]|v)_{\Gamma_*} + \lambda u_* l_*(\rho|v)_{\Gamma_*}\\
&= \lambda\kappa_{\Gamma *}|v|_{\Gamma_*}^2 + d_{\Gamma *}|\nabla_\Gamma v|_{\Gamma_*}^2 - ([\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!]|v)_{\Gamma_*} + \lambda u_* l_*(\rho|v)_{\Gamma_*}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Adding these identities we obtain

$$
0 = \lambda|\sqrt{\kappa_*}v|_\Omega^2 + |\sqrt{d_*}\nabla v|_\Omega^2 + \lambda\kappa_{\Gamma *}|v|_{\Gamma_*}^2 + d_{\Gamma *}|\nabla_\Gamma v|_{\Gamma_*}^2 + \lambda u_* l_*(\rho|v)_{\Gamma_*},
$$

hence employing the Gibbs-Thomson law this results into the relation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda|\sqrt{\kappa_*}v|_\Omega^2 + |\sqrt{d_*}\nabla v|_\Omega^2 + \lambda\kappa_{\Gamma *}|v|_{\Gamma_*}^2 + d_{\Gamma *}|\nabla_\Gamma v|_{\Gamma_*}^2&\\
+ \lambda u_*\sigma_*(A_*\rho|\rho)_{\Gamma_*} + \gamma_* u_*|\lambda|^2|\rho|_{\Gamma_*}^2 &= 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Since A_* is selfadjoint in $L_2(\Gamma_*)$, this identity shows that all eigenvalues of L are real. Decomposing $v = v_0 + \bar{v}$, $v_\Gamma = v_{\Gamma,0} + \bar{v}_\Gamma$, $\rho = \rho_0 + \bar{\rho}$, with the normalizations $(\kappa_*|v_0)_\Omega = (v_{\Gamma,0}|1)_{\Gamma_*} = (\rho_0|1)_{\Gamma_*} = 0$, this identity can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lambda\big\{|\sqrt{\kappa_*}v_0|_\Omega^2 + \kappa_{\Gamma *}|v_{\Gamma,0}|_{\Gamma_*}^2 + \sigma_* u_*(A_*\rho_0|\rho_0)_{\Gamma_*} + \lambda u_*\gamma_*|\rho_0|_{\Gamma_*}^2\big\}\\
&+ |\sqrt{d_*}\nabla v_0|_\Omega^2 + d_{\Gamma *}|\nabla_\Gamma v_{\Gamma,0}|_{\Gamma_*}^2\\
&+ \lambda\Big[(\kappa_*|1)\bar{v}^2 + \kappa_{\Gamma *}|\Gamma_*|\bar{v}_\Gamma^2 - \sigma_* u_*\frac{n-1}{R_*^2}|\Gamma_*|\bar{\rho}^2 + \gamma_* u_*\lambda|\Gamma_*|\bar{\rho}^2\Big] = 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

In case Γ_* is connected, A_* is positive semi-definite on functions with mean zero, and hence the bracket determines whether there are positive eigenvalues. Taking the mean in (4.7) we obtain

$$(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega \bar{v} + \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*|\bar{v}_\Gamma + l_* u_*|\Gamma_*|\bar{\rho} = 0.$$

Hence minimizing the function

$$\phi(\bar{v}, \bar{v}_\Gamma, \bar{\rho}) := (\kappa_*|1)\bar{v}^2 + \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*|\bar{v}_\Gamma^2 - \sigma_* u_* \frac{n-1}{R_*^2}|\Gamma_*|\bar{\rho}^2$$

with respect to the constraint we see that there are no positive eigenvalues provided the stability condition $\zeta_* \leq 1$ is satisfied.

If $\Gamma_* = \bigcup_{1\leq l\leq m} \Gamma_*^l$ consists of $m \geq 1$ spheres Γ_*^l of equal radius, then

$$N(L) = \operatorname{span}\left\{ (\frac{\sigma_*(n-1)u_*}{R_*^2}, -l_*), (0, Y_1^l), \ldots, (0, Y_n^l) \,:\, 1 \leq l \leq m \right\}, \tag{4.8}$$

where the functions Y_j^l denote the *spherical harmonics of degree one* on Γ_*^l (and $Y_j^l \equiv 0$ on $\bigcup_{i\neq l} \Gamma_*^i$), normalized by $(Y_j^l|Y_k^l)_{\Gamma_*^l} = \delta_{jk}$. $N(L)$ is isomorphic to the tangent space of $\mathcal{E}$ at $(u_*, \Gamma_*) \in \mathcal{E}$, as was shown in [18, Theorem 4.5.(vii)].

We can now state the main result on linear stability.

Theorem 4.3. *Let* $\sigma_* > 0$, $\gamma_* \geq 0$, $l_* \neq 0$,

$$\eta_* := (n-1)\sigma_* \kappa_{\Gamma*}/u_* l_*^2 R_*^2 \neq 1 \quad \textit{in case } \gamma_* = 0,$$

and assume that the interface Γ_* *consists of* $m \geq 1$ *components. Let*

$$\zeta_* = \frac{(n-1)\sigma_*[(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*|]}{u_* l_*^2 R_*^2 |\Gamma_*|},$$

and let the equilibrium energy E_e *be defined as in* (2.10). *Then*

- (i) $\mathsf{E}_e'(u_*) = (\zeta_* - 1)u_* l_*^2 R_*^2|\Gamma_*|/(n-1)\sigma_*$.
- (ii) 0 *is a an eigenvalue of* L *with geometric multiplicity* $(mn+1)$.
- (iii) 0 *is semi-simple if* $\zeta_* \neq 1$.
- (iv) *If* Γ_* *is connected and* $\zeta_* \leq 1$, *or if* $\eta_* > 1$ *and* $\gamma_* = 0$, *then all eigenvalues of* $-L$ *are negative, except for the eigenvalue* 0.
- (v) *If* $\zeta_* > 1$, *and* $\eta_* < 1$ *in case* $\gamma_* = 0$, *then there are precisely* m *positive eigenvalues of* $-L$, *where* m *denotes the number of equilibrium spheres.*
- (vi) *If* $\zeta_* \leq 1$, *and* $\eta_* < 1$ *in case* $\gamma_* = 0$ *then* $-L$ *has precisely* $m-1$ *positive eigenvalues.*
- (vii) $N(L)$ *is isomorphic to the tangent space* $T_{(u_*,\Gamma_*)}\mathcal{E}$ *of* $\mathcal{E}$ *at* $(u_*, \Gamma_*) \in \mathcal{E}$.

Remarks 4.4. (a) Formally, the result is also true if $l_* = 0$ and $\gamma_* > 0$. In this case $\mathsf{E}_e'(u_*) = (\kappa_*|1)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*| > 0$ and $\zeta_* = \infty$, hence the equilibrium is unstable. If in addition $\gamma_* = 0$, then the problem is not well-posed.

(b) Note that ζ_* does neither depend on the diffusivities d_*, $d_{\Gamma*}$, nor on the coefficient of undercooling γ_*.

(c) It is shown in [16] that in case $\zeta_* = 1$ and Γ_* connected, the eigenvalue 0 is no longer semi-simple: its algebraic multiplicity rises by 1 to $(n+2)$.

(d) It is remarkable that in case kinetic undercooling is absent, large surface heat capacity, i.e. $\eta_* > 1$, stabilizes the system, even in such a way that multiple spheres are stable, in contrast to the case $\eta_* < 1$.

(e) We can show that, in case $\gamma_* = 0$, if η_* increases to 1 then all positive eigenvalues go to ∞.

We recall a result on the Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator D_λ, $\lambda \geq 0$ which is defined as follows. Let $g \in H_2^{3/2}(\Gamma_*)$ be given. Solve the elliptic transmission problem

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} \kappa_*\lambda w - d_*\Delta w &= 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega\setminus\Gamma_*,\\ \partial_\nu w &= 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega,\\ [\![w]\!] &= 0 \quad \text{on } \Gamma_*,\\ w &= g \quad \text{on } \Gamma_*, \end{aligned}\right. \tag{4.9}$$

and define $D_\lambda g = -[\![d\partial_\nu w]\!] \in H_2^{1/2}(\Gamma_*)$.

Lemma 4.5. *The Dirichlet-to-Neumann operator D_λ has the following well-known properties.*

(a) $(D_\lambda g|g)_{\Gamma_*} = \lambda|\kappa_*^{1/2}w|_\Omega^2 + |d_*^{1/2}\nabla w|_\Omega^2$, *for all* $g \in H_2^{3/2}(\Gamma_*)$*;*

(b) $|D_\lambda g|_{\Gamma_*} \leq C[\lambda^{1/2}|g|_{\Gamma_*} + |g|_{H_2^1(\Gamma_*)}]$, *for all* $g \in H_2^{3/2}(\Gamma_*)$ *and* $\lambda \geq 1$*;*

(c) $(D_\lambda g|g)_{\Gamma_*} \geq c\lambda^{1/2}|g|_{\Gamma_*}^2$, *for all* $g \in H_2^{3/2}(\Gamma_*)$ *and* $\lambda \geq 1$.

In particular, D_λ extends to a self adjoint positive definite linear operator in $L_2(\Gamma_*)$ with domain $H_2^1(\Gamma_*)$.

4.3. **Proof of Theorem 4.3.** For the case that $\kappa_{\Gamma*} = d_{\Gamma*} = 0$ this result is proved in [18]. Assertion (i) follows from the considerations in part (g) of the introduction. Assertions (i), (iii), and (vii) only involve the kernel of L and the manifold of equilibria. Since both are the same as in the case $\kappa_{\Gamma*} = d_{\Gamma*} = 0$, the proofs of (i), (iii) and (vii) given in [18] remain valid in the more general situation considered here. The first part of assertion (iv) has been proved above, it thus remains to prove the assertions in (v) and (vi), and the second part of (iv).

If the stability condition $\zeta_* \leq 1$ does not hold or if Γ_* is disconnected, then there is always a positive eigenvalue. It is a delicate task to prove this. The principal idea to attack this problem is as follows: suppose $\lambda > 0$ is an eigenvalue, and that ρ is known; solve the resolvent diffusion problem

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} \kappa_*\lambda v - d_*\Delta v &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega\setminus\Gamma_*\\ \partial_\nu v &= 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega\\ [\![v]\!] &= 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*\\ v &= v_\Gamma \quad \text{on} \quad \Gamma_* \end{aligned}\right. \tag{4.10}$$

to get $-[\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!] =: D_\lambda v_\Gamma$. Next we solve the resolvent surface diffusion problem

$$\lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*}v_\Gamma - d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* v_\Gamma + D_\lambda v_\Gamma = h,$$

to the result

$$v_\Gamma = T_\lambda h := (\lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*} - d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* + D_\lambda)^{-1}h.$$

Setting $h = -\lambda u_* l_* \rho$ this implies with the linearized Gibbs-Thomson law the equation

$$[(l_*^2 u_*)\lambda T_\lambda + \gamma_*\lambda]\rho + \sigma_* A_* \rho = 0. \tag{4.11}$$

$\lambda > 0$ is an eigenvalue of $-L$ if and only if (4.11) admits a nontrivial solution. We consider this problem in $L_2(\Gamma_*)$. Then A_* is selfadjoint in $L_2(\Gamma_*)$ and

$$\sigma_*(A_*\rho|\rho)_{\Gamma_*} \geq -\frac{(n-1)\sigma_*}{R_*^2}|\rho|_{\Gamma_*}^2,$$

for each $\rho \in D(A_*) = H_2^2(\Gamma_*)$. Moreover, since A_* has compact resolvent, the operator

$$B_\lambda := [(l_*^2 u_*)\lambda T_\lambda + \gamma_*\lambda] + \sigma_* A_* \tag{4.12}$$

has compact resolvent as well, for each $\lambda > 0$. Therefore the spectrum of B_λ consists only of eigenvalues which, in addition, are real. We intend to prove that in case either Γ_* is disconnected or the stability condition does not hold, B_{λ_0} has 0 as an eigenvalue, for some $\lambda_0 > 0$. This has been achieved in [18] in the simpler case where $\kappa_{\Gamma*} = d_{\Gamma*} = 0$, in which case T_λ is the Neumann-to-Dirichlet operator for (4.10). Here we try to use similar ideas as in [18], namely we investigate B_λ for small and for large values of λ. However, in the situation of this paper this will be more involved.

For this purpose we need more information about T_λ. So we first consider the problem

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} \kappa_*\lambda v - d_*\Delta v &= 0 && \text{in} && \Omega\setminus\Gamma_* \\ \partial_\nu v &= 0 && \text{on} && \partial\Omega \\ [\![v]\!] &= 0 && \text{on} && \Gamma_* \\ \lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*}v - d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* v - [\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!] &= g && \text{on} && \Gamma_*. \end{aligned}\right. \tag{4.13}$$

As we have seen above this problem has a unique solution for each $\lambda > 0$, denoted by $v = S_\lambda g$. Obviously for $\lambda = 0$ this problem has a one-dimensional eigenspace spanned by the constant function $\mathsf{e} \equiv 1$. The problem is solvable if and only if the mean value of g is zero, i.e. if $g \in L_{2,0}(\Gamma_*)$. This implies by compactness that $S_\lambda g \to S_0 g$ as well as $T_\lambda \to T_0 g$ as $\lambda \to 0^+$, whenever g has mean zero, where $S_0 g$ means the unique solution of (4.13) for $\lambda = 0$ with mean zero.

(a) Suppose that Γ_* is disconnected. If the interface Γ_* consists of m components Γ_*^k, $k = 1, ..., m$, we set $\mathsf{e}_k = 1$ on Γ_*^k and zero elsewhere. Let $\rho = \sum_k a_k\mathsf{e}_k \neq 0$ with $\sum_k a_k = 0$, hence $Q_0\rho = \rho$, where Q_0 is the canonical projection onto $L_{2,0}(\Gamma_*)$ in $L_2(\Gamma_*)$, $Q_0\rho := \rho - (\rho|\mathsf{e})_{\Gamma_*}/|\Gamma_*|$. Then

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0}\lambda T_\lambda\rho = \lim_{\lambda\to 0}\lambda T_\lambda Q_0\rho = 0,$$

since $T_\lambda Q_0$ is bounded as $\lambda \to 0$. This implies

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0}(B_\lambda\rho|\rho)_{\Gamma_*} = -\left((n-1)\sigma_*/R_*^2\right)\sum_k |\Gamma_*^k| a_k^2 < 0.$$

Therefore B_λ is not positive semi-definite for small λ.

(b) Suppose next that Γ_* is connected. Consider $\rho = \mathsf{e}$. Then we have

$$(B_\lambda \mathsf{e}|\mathsf{e})_{\Gamma_*} = u_* l_*^2 \lambda (T_\lambda \mathsf{e}|\mathsf{e})_{\Gamma_*} + \lambda\gamma_* |\mathsf{e}|^2_{\Gamma_*} - ((n-1)\sigma_*/R_*^2)|\mathsf{e}|^2_{\Gamma_*}.$$

We compute the limit $\lim_{\lambda\to 0} \lambda(T_\lambda \mathsf{e}|\mathsf{e})_{\Gamma_*}$ as follows. First solve the problem

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} -d_*\Delta v &= -\kappa_* a_0 && \text{in} \quad \Omega\setminus\Gamma_* \\ \partial_\nu v &= 0 && \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \\ [\![v]\!] &= 0 && \text{on} \quad \Gamma_* \\ -d_{\Gamma *}\Delta_\Gamma v - [\![d_*\partial_\nu v]\!] &= \mathsf{e} - \kappa_{\Gamma *} a_0 && \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*, \end{aligned}\right. \tag{4.14}$$

where $a_0 = |\Gamma_*|/[(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma *}|\Gamma_*|]$, which is solvable since the necessary compatibility condition holds. Let v_0 denote the solution which satisfies the normalization condition $(\kappa_*|v_0)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma *}(v_0|1)_{\Gamma_*} = 0$. Then $v_\lambda := S_\lambda \mathsf{e} - v_0 - a_0/\lambda$ satisfies the problem

$$\left\{\begin{aligned} \kappa_*\lambda v_\lambda - d_*\Delta v_\lambda &= -\kappa_*\lambda v_0 && \text{in} \quad \Omega\setminus\Gamma_* \\ \partial_\nu v &= 0 && \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega \\ [\![v_\lambda]\!] &= 0 && \text{on} \quad \Gamma_* \\ \kappa_{\Gamma *}\lambda v_\lambda - d_{\Gamma *}\Delta_* v_\lambda - [\![d_*\partial_\nu v_\lambda]\!] &= -\lambda\kappa_{\Gamma *} v_0 && \text{on} \quad \Gamma_*. \end{aligned}\right. \tag{4.15}$$

By the normalization $(\kappa_*|v_0)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma *}(v_0|1)_{\Gamma_*} = 0$ we see that the compatibility condition for (4.13) holds for each $\lambda > 0$, and so we conclude that v_λ is bounded in $W^2_2(\Omega\setminus\Gamma_*)$ as $\lambda \to 0$, it even converges to 0. Hence we have

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0} \lambda T_\lambda \mathsf{e} = \lim_{\lambda\to 0} [(\lambda v_\lambda + \lambda v_0)|_{\Gamma_*} + a_0] = a_0.$$

This then implies

$$\lim_{\lambda\to 0} (B_\lambda \mathsf{e}|\mathsf{e})_{\Gamma_*} = l_*^2 u_* \frac{|\Gamma_*|^2}{(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma *}|\Gamma_*|} - \frac{(n-1)\sigma_*|\Gamma_*|}{R_*^2} < 0,$$

if the stability condition does not hold, i.e. if $\zeta_* > 1$. Therefore also in this case B_λ is not positive semi-definite for small $\lambda > 0$.

(c) Next we consider the behavior of $(B_\lambda\rho|\rho)_{\Gamma_*}$ as $\lambda \to \infty$. We intend to show that B_λ is positive definite for large λ. We have

$$\lambda T_\lambda = \lambda(\kappa_{\Gamma *}\lambda - d_{\Gamma *}\Delta_\Gamma + D_\lambda)^{-1} \to 1/\kappa_{\Gamma *} \quad \text{for} \ \ \lambda\to\infty,$$

as D_λ is of lower order, by (b) of Lemma 4.5. This implies for a given $g \in D(A_*)$

$$\begin{aligned} (B_\lambda g|g)_{\Gamma_*} &= l_*^2 u_* \lambda (T_\lambda g|g)_{\Gamma_*} + \sigma_*(A_* g|g)_{\Gamma *} + \gamma_*\lambda |g|^2_{\Gamma_*} \\ &\geq (\gamma_*\lambda - \frac{(n-1)\sigma_*}{R_*^2})|g|^2_{\Gamma_*} + l_*^2 u_* \lambda (T_\lambda g|g)_{\Gamma_*} \\ &\sim (\gamma_*\lambda - \frac{(n-1)\sigma_*}{R_*^2} + \frac{l_*^2 u_*}{\kappa_{\Gamma *}})|g|^2_{\Gamma_*}, \end{aligned}$$

as $\lambda \to \infty$. We have thus shown that B_λ is positive definite if $\gamma_* > 0$ and $\lambda > (n-1)\sigma_*/\gamma_* R_*^2$, or if

$$\gamma_* = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad l_*^2 u_*/\kappa_{\Gamma*} > (n-1)\sigma_*/R_*^2. \tag{4.16}$$

In particular, for $\gamma_* = 0$ and small l_*^2 the latter condition condition will be violated, in general.

(d) In summary, concentrating on the cases $\gamma* > 0$ or (4.16), we have shown that B_λ is not positive semi-definite for small $\lambda > 0$ if either Γ_* is not connected or the stability condition does not hold, and B_λ is always positive definite for large λ. Let

$$\lambda_0 = \sup\{\lambda > 0 : \, B_\mu \text{ is not positive semi-definite for each } \mu \in (0, \lambda]\}.$$

Since B_λ has compact resolvent, B_λ has a negative eigenvalue for each $\lambda < \lambda_0$. This implies that 0 is an eigenvalue of B_{λ_0}, thereby proving that $-L$ admits the positive eigenvalue λ_0.

Moreover, we have also shown that

$$B_0\rho = \lim_{\lambda\to 0}[l_*^2 u_* \lambda T_\lambda \rho + \gamma_* \lambda\rho + \sigma_* A_* \rho] = \frac{l_*^2 u_* |\Gamma_*|}{(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*|} P_0\rho + \sigma_* A_* \rho,$$

where $P_0\rho := (I - Q_0)\rho = (\rho|\mathsf{e})_{\Gamma_*}/|\Gamma_*|$. Therefore, B_0 has the eigenvalue

$$\frac{u_* l_*^2 |\Gamma_*|}{(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*|} - \frac{(n-1)\sigma_*}{R_*^2} = \frac{u_* l_*^2 |\Gamma_*|}{(\kappa_*|1)_\Omega + \kappa_{\Gamma*}|\Gamma_*|}(1 - \zeta_*)$$

with eigenfunction e, and in case $m > 1$ it also has the eigenvalue $-(n-1)\sigma_*/R_*^2$ with precisely $m-1$ linearly independent eigenfunctions of the form $\sum_k a_k \mathsf{e}_k$ with $\sum_k a_k = 0$.

As λ varies from 0 to λ_0, all the negative eigenvalues of B_0 identified above will eventually have to cross 0 along the real axis. At each of these occasions, $-L$ will inherit at least one positive eigenvalue, which will then remain positive. This implies that $-L$ has exactly m positive eigenvalues if the stability condition does not hold, and $m-1$ otherwise. This covers the case $\gamma_* > 0$ as well as (4.16).

(e) To cover the remaining we assume $\gamma_* = 0$ and $\kappa_{\Gamma*}(n-1)/R_*^2 > u_* l_*^2/\sigma_* =: \delta_*$. Suppose $\lambda > 0$ is an eigenvalue of L_0. Then there is $\rho \neq 0$ such that

$$(\lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*} - d_{\Gamma*}\Delta_* + D_\lambda)A_*\rho + \lambda\delta_*\rho = 0.$$

Multiplying this equation in $L_2(\Gamma_*)$ by $A_*\rho$ and integrating by parts one obtains the identity

$$\lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*}|A_*\rho|_{\Gamma_*}^2 + d_{\Gamma*}|\nabla_{\Gamma_*}A_*\rho|_{\Gamma_*}^2 + (D_\lambda A_*\rho|A_*\rho)_{\Gamma_*} + \lambda\delta_*(A_*\rho|\rho)_{\Gamma_*} = 0.$$

As D_λ is positive definite in $L_2(\Gamma_*)$ this equation implies

$$\lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*}|A_*\rho|_{\Gamma_*}^2 + \lambda\delta_*(A_*\rho|\rho)_{\Gamma_*} \leq 0.$$

Let P denote the projection onto the kernel $\mathcal{N}(\Delta_*)$ and $Q = I - P$. Since P, Q commute with A_* this implies

$$\lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*}|A_*Q\rho|^2_{\Gamma_*} + \lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*}|A_*P\rho|^2_{\Gamma_*} + \lambda\delta_*(A_*P\rho|P\rho)_{\Gamma_*} \leq 0,$$

as A_* is positive semi-definite on $\mathcal{R}(Q) = \mathcal{R}(\Delta_*)$. Now $A_*P = -((n-1)/R_*^2)P$ and

$$0 \geq \lambda\kappa_{\Gamma*}|A_*P\rho|^2_{\Gamma_*} + \lambda\delta_*(A_*P\rho|P\rho)_{\Gamma_*} = \lambda\frac{n-1}{R_*^2}\Big[\kappa_{\Gamma*}\frac{n-1}{R_*^2} - \delta_*\Big]|P\rho|^2_{\Gamma_*} \geq 0,$$

hence $P\rho = 0$ and $A_*Q\rho = 0$. This implies $A_*\rho = 0$ and therefore $\rho = 0$ as $\delta_* > 0$. This shows that there are no positive eigenvalues of L_0 in case $\gamma_* = 0$ and $\kappa_{\Gamma*}(n-1)/R_*^2 > u_*l_*^2/\sigma_*$. This completes the proof.

5. The Semiflow in Presence of Kinetic Undercooling

In this section we assume throughout $\gamma(s) > 0$ for all $0 < s < u_c$, i.e. kinetic undercooling is present at the relevant temperature range. In this case we may apply the results in [17] and [10], resulting in a rather complete analysis of the problem.

5.1. Local Well-Posedness.

To prove local well-posedness we employ the direct mapping method as introduced in Section 3. As base space we use

$$X_0 = L_p(\Omega) \times W_p^{-1/p}(\Sigma) \times W_p^{1-1/p}(\Sigma),$$

and we set

$$X_1 = \big\{(v, v_\Gamma, \rho) \in H_p^2(\Omega\setminus\Sigma) \times W_p^{2-1/p}(\Sigma) \times W_p^{3-1/p}(\Sigma) : \\ [\![v]\!] = 0,\ v_\Gamma = v_{|_\Sigma},\ \partial_\nu v_{|_{\partial\Omega}} = 0\big\}.$$

The trace space X_γ then becomes for $p > n+2$

$$X_\gamma = \big\{(v, v_\Gamma, \rho) \in W_p^{2-2/p}(\Omega\setminus\Sigma) \times W_p^{2-3/p}(\Sigma) \times W_p^{3-3/p}(\Sigma) : \\ [\![v]\!] = 0,\ v_\Gamma = v_{|_\Sigma},\ \partial_\nu v_{|_{\partial\Omega}} = 0\big\},$$

and that with the time weight $t^{1-\mu}$, $1 \geq \mu > 1/p$,

$$X_{\gamma,\mu} = \big\{(v, v_\Gamma, \rho) \in W_p^{2\mu-2/p}(\Omega\setminus\Sigma) \times W_p^{2\mu-3/p}(\Sigma) \times W_p^{2\mu+1-3/p}(\Sigma) : \\ [\![v]\!] = 0,\ v_\Gamma = v_{|_\Sigma},\ \partial_\nu v_{|_{\partial\Omega}} = 0\big\},$$

Note that

$$X_{\gamma,\mu} \hookrightarrow BUC^1(\Omega\setminus\Sigma) \times C^1(\Sigma) \times C^2(\Sigma), \tag{5.1}$$

provided $2\mu > 1 + (n+2)/p$, which is feasible as $p > n+2$. In the sequel, we only consider this range of μ. We want to rewrite system (3.2) abstractly as the quasilinear problem in X_0

$$\dot{z} + A(z)z = F(z), \quad z(0) = z_0, \tag{5.2}$$

where $z = (v, v_\Gamma, \rho)$ and $z_0 = (v_0, v_{\Gamma 0}, \rho_0)$. Here the quasilinear part $A(z)$ is the diagonal matrix operator defined by

$$-A(z) = \operatorname{diag}\begin{bmatrix} (d(v)/\kappa(v))(\Delta - M_2(\rho) : \nabla^2) \\ (d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)/\kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma))(P_\Gamma(\rho)M_0(\rho))^2 : \nabla_\Sigma^2 \\ (\sigma(v_\Gamma)/\gamma(v_\Gamma))\mathcal{G}(\rho) : \nabla_\Sigma^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $M_2(\rho) = M_1(\rho) + M_1^{\mathsf{T}}(\rho) - M_1(\rho)M_1^{\mathsf{T}}(\rho)$. The semilinear part $F(z)$ is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{R}(\rho)v + \dfrac{1}{\kappa(v)}\big\{d'(v)|(I - M_1(\rho))\nabla v\big|^2 - d(v)((I - M_1(\rho)) : \nabla M_1(\rho)|\nabla v)\big\} \\ -\dfrac{1}{\kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)}\big\{\mathcal{B}(v_\Gamma, \rho)v - [(l(v_\Gamma) + l_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\rho) - \gamma(v_\Gamma)\beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho]\beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho + m_3\big\} \\ \varphi(v_\Gamma)/\beta(\rho)\gamma(v_\Gamma) + \sigma(v_\Gamma)\mathcal{F}(\rho)/\gamma(v_\Gamma) \end{bmatrix}$$

where $\varphi(s) = [\![\psi(s)]\!]$ and

$$m_3 = -d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)(P_\Gamma(\rho)M_0(\rho))^2 : \nabla_\Sigma^2 v_\Gamma - \mathcal{C}(v_\Gamma, \rho)v_\Gamma.$$

We note that m_3 depends on v_Γ, $\nabla_\Sigma v_\Gamma$, and on ρ, $\nabla_\Sigma\rho$, $\nabla_\Sigma^2\rho$, but not on $\nabla_\Sigma^2 v_\Gamma$, hence is of lower order. Apparently, the first two components of $F(z)$ contain the time derivative $\partial_t\rho$; we may replace it by

$$\partial_t\rho = \{\varphi(v_\Gamma) + \mathcal{H}(\rho)\}/\beta(\rho)\gamma(v_\Gamma),$$

to see that it is of lower order as well.

Now fix a ball $\mathbb{B} := B_{X_{\gamma,\mu}}(z_0, R)) \subset X_{\gamma,\mu}$, where $|\rho_0|_{C^1(\Sigma)} \leq \eta$ for some sufficiently small $\eta > 0$. Then it is not difficult to verify that

$$(A, F) \in C^1(\mathbb{B}, \mathcal{B}(X_1, X_0) \times X_0)$$

provided $d_i, \psi_i, d_\Gamma, \sigma, \gamma \in C^3(0, \infty)$ and $d_j, \kappa_j, \sigma, \gamma > 0$ on $(0, u_c)$, $j = 1, 2, \Gamma$, and provided $2 \geq 2\mu > 1 + n + 2/p$ as before. Moreover, as $A(z)$ is diagonal, well-known results about elliptic differential operators show that $A(z)$ has the property of maximal regularity of type L_p, and also of type $L_{p,\mu}$, for each $z \in \mathbb{B}$. In fact, for small $\eta > 0$, $A(z)$ is small perturbation of

$$A_\#(z) = \operatorname{diag}\big[-(d(v)/\kappa(v))\Delta, -(d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)/\kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma))\Delta_\Sigma, -(\sigma(v_\Gamma)/\gamma(v_\Gamma))\Delta_\Sigma\big].$$

Therefore we may apply [10, Theorem 2.1] to obtain local well-posedness of (5.2), i.e. a unique local solution

$$z \in H^1_{p,\mu}((0, a); X_0) \cap L_{p,\mu}((0, a); X_1) \hookrightarrow C([0, a]; X_{\gamma,\mu}) \cap C((0, a]; X_\gamma)$$

which depends continuously on the initial value $z_0 \in \mathbb{B}$. The resulting solution map $[z_0 \mapsto z(t)]$ defines a local semiflow in $X_{\gamma,\mu}$.

5.2. **Nonlinear Stability of Equilibria.** Let $e_* = (u_*, u_{\Gamma *}, \Gamma_*)$ denote an equilibrium as in Section 4. In this case we choose $\Sigma = \Gamma_*$ as a reference manifold, and as shown in the previous subsection we obtain the abstract quasilinear parabolic problem

$$\dot{z} + A(z)z = F(z), \quad z(0) = z_0, \tag{5.3}$$

with X_0, X_1, X_γ as above. We set $z_* = (u_*, u_{\Gamma *}, 0)$. Assuming that $\zeta_* \neq 0$ in the stability condition, we have shown in Section 4 that the equilibrium z_* is normally hyperbolic. Therefore we may apply [17, Theorems 2.1 and 6.1] to obtain the following result.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $p > n + 2$. Suppose $\gamma > 0$ on $(0, u_c)$ and the assumptions of* (1.5) *hold true. As above $\mathcal{E}$ denotes the set of equilibria of* (5.3)*, and we fix some $z_* \in \mathcal{E}$. Then we have*

(a) *If Γ_* is connected and $\zeta_* < 1$ then z_* is stable in X_γ, and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the unique solution $z(t)$ of (5.3) with initial value $z_0 \in X_\gamma$ satisfying $|z_0 - z_*|_\gamma < \delta$ exists on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and converges at an exponential rate in X_γ to some $z_\infty \in \mathcal{E}$ as $t \to \infty$.*

(b) *If Γ_* is disconnected or if $\zeta_* > 1$ then z_* is unstable in X_γ and even in X_0. For each sufficiently small $\rho > 0$ there is $\delta \in (0, \rho]$ such that the solution $z(t)$ of* (5.3) *with initial value $z_0 \in X_\gamma$ subject to $|z_0 - z_*|_\gamma < \delta$ either satisfies*

(i) $\mathrm{dist}_{X_\gamma}(z(t_0); \mathcal{E}) > \rho$ *for some finite time $t_0 > 0$; or*

(ii) *$z(t)$ exists on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and converges at exponential rate in X_γ to some $z_\infty \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Remark 5.2. The only equilibria which are excluded from our analysis are those with $\zeta_* = 1$, which means $\mathsf{E}_e'(u_*) = 0$. These are critical points of the function $\mathsf{E}_e(u)$ at which a bifurcation may occur. In fact, if such u_* is a maximum or a minimum of E_e then two branches of $\mathcal{E}$ meet at u_*, a stable and and an unstable one, which means that (u_*, Γ_*) is a turning point in $\mathcal{E}$.

5.3. **The Local Semiflow on the State Manifold.** Here we follow the approach introduced in [11] for the two-phase Navier-Stokes problem and in [18] for the two-phase Stefan problem, see also [10] for the Mullins-Sekerka problem.

We denote by $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$ the closed C^2-hypersurfaces contained in Ω. It can be shown that $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$ is a C^2-manifold: the charts are the parameterizations over a given hypersurface Σ according to Section 3, and the tangent space consists of the normal vector fields on Σ. We define a metric on $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$ by means of

$$d_{\mathcal{MH}^2}(\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2) := d_H(\mathcal{N}^2\Sigma_1, \mathcal{N}^2\Sigma_2),$$

where d_H denotes the Hausdorff metric on the compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ introduced in Section 2. This way $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$ becomes a Banach manifold of class C^2.

Let $d_\Sigma(x)$ denote the signed distance for Σ as in Section 2. We may then define the *canonical level function* φ_Σ by means of

$$\varphi_\Sigma(x) = \phi(d_\Sigma(x)), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

where

$$\phi(s) = s\chi(s/a) + (1-\chi(s/a))\operatorname{sgn} s, \quad s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Then it is easy to see that $\Sigma = \varphi_\Sigma^{-1}(0)$, and $\nabla\varphi_\Sigma(x) = \nu_\Sigma(x)$, for $x \in \Sigma$. Moreover, 0 is an eigenvalue of $\nabla^2\varphi_\Sigma(x)$, and the remaining eigenvalues of $\nabla^2\varphi_\Sigma(x)$ are the principal curvatures of Σ at $x \in \Sigma$.

If we consider the subset $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega, r)$ of $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$ which consists of all closed hypersurfaces $\Gamma \in \mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$ such that $\Gamma \subset \Omega$ satisfies a (interior and exterior) ball condition with fixed radius $r > 0$, then the map

$$\Upsilon : \mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega, r) \to C^2(\bar{\Omega}), \quad \Upsilon(\Gamma) := \varphi_\Gamma, \tag{5.4}$$

is an isomorphism of the metric space $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega, r)$ onto $\Upsilon(\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega, r)) \subset C^2(\bar{\Omega})$.

Let $s - (n-1)/p > 2$. Then we define

$$W^s_p(\Omega, r) := \{\Gamma \in \mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega, r) : \varphi_\Gamma \in W^s_p(\Omega)\}. \tag{5.5}$$

In this case the local charts for Γ can be chosen of class W^s_p as well. A subset $A \subset W^s_p(\Omega, r)$ is said to be (relatively) compact, if $\Upsilon(A) \subset W^s_p(\Omega)$ is (relatively) compact.

As an ambient space for the state manifold of (1.6) we consider the product space $C(\bar{G}) \times \mathcal{MH}^2$, due to continuity of temperature and curvature.

We define the state manifold $\mathcal{SM}$ for (1.6) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{SM} := \big\{(u, \Gamma) \in C(\bar{\Omega}) \times \mathcal{MH}^2 : u \in W^{2-2/p}_p(\Omega \setminus \Gamma),\ \Gamma \in W^{3-3/p}_p, \\ 0 < u < u_c \text{ in } \bar{\Omega},\ \partial_\nu u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega\big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Charts for this manifold are obtained by the charts induced by $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$ followed by a Hanzawa transformation as in Section 3. Note that there is no need to incorporate the dummy variable u_Γ into the definition of the state manifold, as $u_\Gamma = u|_\Gamma$ whenever u_Γ appears.

Applying the result in subsection 5.1 and re-parameterizing the interface repeatedly, we see that (1.6) yields a local semiflow on $\mathcal{SM}$.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $p > n + 2$. Suppose $\gamma > 0$ on $(0, u_c)$ and the assumptions of* (1.5) *hold true.*

Then problem (1.6) generates a local semiflow on the state manifold $\mathcal{SM}$. Each solution (u, Γ) exists on a maximal time interval $[0, t_*)$, where $t_* = t_*(u_0, \Gamma_0)$.

5.4. **Global Existence and Convergence.** There are several obstructions to global existence for the Stefan problem with variable surface tension (1.6):

- *regularity*: the norms of $u(t)$ or $\Gamma(t)$ become unbounded;
- *well-posedness*: the temperature may reach 0 or u_c;
- *geometry*: the topology of the interface changes;
  or the interface touches the boundary of Ω;
  or the interface contracts to a point.

Let (u,Γ) be a solution in the state manifold $\mathcal{SM}$. By a *uniform ball condition* we mean the existence of a radius $r_0>0$ such that for each t, at each point $x\in\Gamma(t)$ there exist centers $x_i\in\Omega_i(t)$ such that $B_{r_0}(x_i)\subset\Omega_i$ and $\Gamma(t)\cap\bar{B}_{r_0}(x_i)=\{x\}$, $i=1,2$. Note that this condition bounds the curvature of $\Gamma(t)$, prevents it from shrinking to a point, from touching the outer boundary $\partial\Omega$, and from undergoing topological changes.

With this property, combining the semiflow for (1.6) with the Lyapunov functional and compactness we obtain the following result.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $p>n+2$. Suppose $\gamma>0$ on $(0,u_c)$ and the assumptions of* (1.5) *hold true. Suppose that (u,Γ) is a solution of (1.6) in the state manifold $\mathcal{SM}$ on its maximal time interval $[0,t_*)$. Assume the following on $[0,t_*)$: there is a constant $M>0$ such that*

(i) $|u(t)|_{W^{2-2/p}_p}+|\Gamma(t)|_{W^{3-3/p}_p}\le M<\infty$;

(ii) $0<1/M\le u(t)\le u_c-1/M$;

(iii) $\Gamma(t)$ *satisfies a uniform ball condition.*

Then $t_*=\infty$, i.e. the solution exists globally, and it converges in $\mathcal{SM}$ to some equilibrium $(u_\infty,\Gamma_\infty)\in\mathcal{E}$. On the contrary, if $(u(t),\Gamma(t))$ is a global solution in $\mathcal{SM}$ which converges to an equilibrium (u_*,Γ_*) in $\mathcal{SM}$ as $t\to\infty$, then properties (i)-(iii) are valid.

Proof. Assume that assertions (i)–(iii) are valid. Then $\Gamma([0,t_*))\subset W^{3-3/p}_p(\Omega,r)$ is bounded, hence relatively compact in $W^{3-3/p-\varepsilon}_p(\Omega,r)$. Thus we may cover this set by finitely many balls with centers Σ_k real analytic in such a way that $\mathrm{dist}_{W^{3-3/p-\varepsilon}_p}(\Gamma(t),\Sigma_j)\le\delta$ for some $j=j(t)$, $t\in[0,t_*)$. Let $J_k=\{t\in[0,t_*):j(t)=k\}$. Using for each k a Hanzawa-transformation Ξ_k, we see that the pull backs $\{u(t,\cdot)\circ\Xi_k:\,t\in J_k\}$ are bounded in $W^{2-2/p}_p(\Omega\setminus\Sigma_k)$, hence relatively compact in $W^{2-2/p-\varepsilon}_p(\Omega\setminus\Sigma_k)$. Employing now the results in subsection 5.1 we obtain solutions (u^1,Γ^1) with initial configurations $(u(t),\Gamma(t))$ in the state manifold on a common time interval, say $(0,\tau]$, and by uniqueness we have

$$(u^1(\tau),\Gamma^1(\tau))=(u(t+\tau),\Gamma(t+\tau)).$$

Continuous dependence implies then relative compactness of $(u(\cdot),\Gamma(\cdot))$ in $\mathcal{SM}$. In particular, $t_*=\infty$ and the orbit $(u,\Gamma)(\mathbb{R}_+)\subset\mathcal{SM}$ is relatively compact. The negative total entropy is a strict Lyapunov functional, hence the limit set $\omega(u,\Gamma)\subset\mathcal{SM}$ of a solution is contained in the set $\mathcal{E}$ of equilibria. By compactness $\omega(u,\Gamma)\subset\mathcal{SM}$ is non-empty, hence the solution comes close to $\mathcal{E}$, and stays there. Then we may apply the convergence result Theorem 5.1. The converse is proved by a compactness argument. □

6. The Semiflow without Kinetic Undercooling

In this section we assume throughout $\gamma(s)=0$ for all $s>0$, i.e kinetic undercooling is absent. In this case we may apply the results in [17] and [10] too, but we have to work harder to apply them. At first we prove (1.11) as follows. According to (1.8) we know that

$$T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)V := (\omega_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) - \mathcal{H}'(\Gamma))V = \frac{\lambda'(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\big\{\mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma) + \llbracket d(u)\partial_\nu u\rrbracket\big\}.$$

Next we observe

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\lambda'(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma)\\
&\qquad= \frac{1}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\mathrm{div}_\Gamma(d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\nabla_\Gamma\lambda(u_\Gamma)) - \frac{d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\lambda''(u_\Gamma)|\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma|^2\\
&\qquad= \mathrm{div}_\Gamma\Big(\frac{d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\nabla_\Gamma\lambda(u_\Gamma)\Big) - \frac{d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\Big\{\lambda''(u_\Gamma) - \lambda'(u_\Gamma)\frac{\kappa_\Gamma'(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\Big\}|\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma|^2\\
&\qquad= \Delta_\Gamma h_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\frac{d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\Big\{\lambda''(u_\Gamma) - \lambda'(u_\Gamma)\frac{\kappa_\Gamma'(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\Big\}|\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma|^2
\end{aligned}$$

where h_Γ denotes the antiderivative of $d_\Gamma\lambda'/\kappa_\Gamma$ with $h_\Gamma(u_m) = 0$. We note that by a partial integration

$$h_\Gamma(s) = \lambda(s)\frac{d_\Gamma(s)}{\kappa_\Gamma(s)} - \int_{u_m}^{s}\lambda(\tau)(\frac{d_\Gamma}{\kappa_\Gamma})'(\tau)d\tau =: \lambda(s)\frac{d_\Gamma(s)}{\kappa_\Gamma(s)} - f_\Gamma(s).$$

Now employing $\lambda(u_\Gamma) = -\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)$ leads to the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\{V - \frac{d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\mathcal{H}(\Gamma) - f_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\}\\
&= \frac{\lambda'(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\llbracket d(u)\partial_\nu u\rrbracket - \frac{d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\{\lambda''(u_\Gamma) - \lambda'(u_\Gamma)\frac{\kappa_\Gamma'(u_\Gamma)}{\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)}\}|\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma|^2\\
&+ [\,\omega_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) - \mathrm{tr}L_\Gamma^2\,]h_\Gamma(u_\Gamma),
\end{aligned}$$

hence applying the inverse of $T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)$ we arrive at

$$\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)V - d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\Gamma) = \kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\{f_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) + F_\Gamma(u, u_\Gamma)\}, \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
F_\Gamma(u, u_\Gamma) = [\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)]^{-1}\big\{&\lambda'(u_\Gamma)\llbracket d(u)\partial_\nu u\rrbracket\\
&- d_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)[(\lambda''(u_\Gamma) - \lambda'(u_\Gamma)\kappa_\Gamma'(u_\Gamma)/\kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)]|\nabla_\Gamma u_\Gamma|^2\\
&+ \kappa_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)[\,\omega_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) - \mathrm{tr}L_\Gamma^2\,]h_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)\big\}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the sequel we will replace the Gibbs-Thomson law by the dynamic equation (6.1) plus the compatibility condition $\varphi(u_{\Gamma 0}) + \sigma(u_{\Gamma 0})\mathcal{H}(\Gamma_0) = 0$ at time $t = 0$.

6.1. **Local Well-Posedness.** To prove local well-posedness we employ the direct mapping method as introduced in Section 3. As base space we use as in Section 5

$$X_0 = L_p(\Omega) \times W_p^{-1/p}(\Sigma) \times W_p^{1-1/p}(\Sigma),$$

and we let X_1, X_γ and $X_{\gamma,\mu}$ as defined there.

We rewrite system (3.2) abstractly as the quasilinear problem in X_0

$$\dot{z} + A_0(z)z = F_0(z), \quad z(0) = z_0, \tag{6.2}$$

where $z = (v, v_\Gamma, \rho)$ and $z_0 = (v_0, v_{\Gamma 0}, \rho_0)$. Here the quasilinear part $A_0(z)$ is the diagonal matrix operator defined by

$$-A_0(z) = \operatorname{diag}\begin{bmatrix} (d(v)/\kappa(v))(\Delta - M_2(\rho) : \nabla^2) \\ (d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)/\kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma))(P_\Gamma(\rho)M_0(\rho))^2 : \nabla_\Sigma^2 \\ (d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)/\kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma))\mathcal{G}(\rho) : \nabla_\Sigma^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

with $M_2(\rho) = M_1(\rho) + M_1^{\mathsf{T}}(\rho) - M_1(\rho)M_1^{\mathsf{T}}(\rho)$. The semilinear part $F_0(z)$ is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{R}(\rho)v + \dfrac{1}{\kappa(v)}\big\{d'(v)|(I - M_1(\rho))\nabla v\big|^2 - d(v)((I - M_1(\rho)) : \nabla M_1(\rho)|\nabla v)\big\} \\ -\dfrac{1}{\kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)}\big\{\mathcal{B}(v_\Gamma, \rho)v - [(l(v_\Gamma) + l_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\rho) - \gamma(v_\Gamma)\beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho]\beta(\rho)\partial_t\rho + m_3\big\} \\ (d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)/\kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma))\mathcal{F}(\rho) + \big\{f_\Gamma(v_\Gamma) + F_\Gamma(v, v_\Gamma, \rho)\big\}/\beta(\rho) \end{bmatrix}$$

where by abuse of notation F_Γ here means the transformed F_Γ introduced previously, and where

$$m_3 = -d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)(P_\Gamma(\rho)M_0(\rho))^2 : \nabla_\Sigma^2 v_\Gamma - \mathcal{C}(v_\Gamma, \rho)v_\Gamma.$$

Again, the first two components of $F_0(z)$ contain the time derivative $\partial_t\rho$. We replace it by the transformed version of (6.1)

$$\partial_t\rho = \big\{f_\Gamma(v_\Gamma) + F_\Gamma(v, v_\Gamma, \rho) + d_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)/\kappa_\Gamma(v_\Gamma)\mathcal{H}(\rho)\big\}/\beta(\rho),$$

to see that it leads to a lower order term, as in Section 5.

Provided that $T_{\Gamma_0}(v_{\Gamma 0})$ is invertible we may proceed as in Section 5, applying Theorem 2.1 in [10], to obtain local well-posedness, i.e. a unique local solution

$$z \in H^1_{p,\mu}((0,a); X_0) \cap L_{p,\mu}((0,a); X_1) \hookrightarrow C([0,a]; X_{\gamma,\mu}) \cap C((0,a]; X_\gamma)$$

which depends continuously on the initial value $z_0 \in \mathbb{B}$. The resulting solution map $[z_0 \mapsto z(t)]$ defines a local semiflow in $X_{\gamma,\mu}$.

6.2. **Nonlinear Stability of Equilibria.** Let $e_* = (u_*, u_{\Gamma *}, \Gamma_*)$ denote an equilibrium as in Section 4. In this case we choose $\Sigma = \Gamma_*$ as a reference manifold, and as shown in the previous subsection we obtain the abstract quasilinear parabolic problem

$$\dot{z} + A_0(z)z = F_0(z), \quad z(0) = z_0, \tag{6.3}$$

with X_0, X_1, X_γ as above. We set $z_* = (u_*, u_{\Gamma *}, 0)$. Assuming well-posedness and $\zeta_* \neq 1$ in stability condition, we have shown in Section 4 that the equilibrium e_* is normally hyperbolic. Therefore we may apply once more [17], Theorems 2.1 and 6.1 to obtain the following result.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $p > n+2$. Suppose $\gamma \equiv 0$, $\sigma \in C^4(0, u_c)$, and the assumptions of* (1.5) *hold true. As above $\mathcal{E}$ denotes the set of equilibria of* (5.3)*, and we fix some $z_* \in \mathcal{E}$. Assume that the well-posedness condition*

$$l_* \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u_* l_*^2/\sigma_* \neq \kappa_{\Gamma *}(n-1)/R_*^2 \tag{6.4}$$

is satisfied. Then we have

(a) *If Γ_* is connected and $\zeta_* < 1$, or if $\kappa_{\Gamma *}(n-1)/R_*^2 > u_* l_*^2/\sigma_*$ then z_* is stable in X_γ, and there exists $\delta > 0$ such that the unique solution $z(t)$ of (5.3) with initial value $z_0 \in X_\gamma$ satisfying $|z_0 - z_*|_\gamma < \delta$ exists on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and converges at an exponential rate in X_γ to some $z_\infty \in \mathcal{E}$ as $t \to \infty$.*

(b) *If $\kappa_{\Gamma *}(n-1)/R_*^2 < u_* l_*^2/\sigma_*$, and if Γ_* is disconnected or if $\zeta_* > 1$ then z_* is unstable in X_γ and even in X_0. For each sufficiently small $\rho > 0$ there is $\delta \in (0, \rho]$ such that the solution $z(t)$ of* (5.3) *with initial value $z_0 \in X_\gamma$ subject to $|z_0 - z_*|_\gamma < \delta$ either satisfies*

(i) $\mathrm{dist}_{X_\gamma}(z(t_0); \mathcal{E}) > \rho$ *for some finite time $t_0 > 0$; or*

(ii) *$z(t)$ exists on $\mathbb{R}_+$ and converges at exponential rate in X_γ to some $z_\infty \in \mathcal{E}$.*

Thus the only cases which are excluded are $\zeta_* = 1$, and the two values where the well-posedness condition (6.4) is violated.

6.3. **The Local Semiflow on the State Manifold.**

We define the state manifolds $\mathcal{SM}_0$ for (1.6) in case $\gamma \equiv 0$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{SM}_0 := \big\{ &(u, \Gamma) \in C(\bar\Omega) \times \mathcal{MH}^2 : u \in W_p^{2-2/p}(\Omega \setminus \Gamma),\ \Gamma \in W_p^{3-3/p}, \\ &0 < u < u_c \text{ in } \bar\Omega,\ \partial_\nu u = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \\ &\lambda(u_\Gamma) + \mathcal{H}(\Gamma) = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma,\ T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma) \text{ is invertible in } L_2(\Gamma) \big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.5}$$

Charts for this manifold are obtained by the charts induced by $\mathcal{MH}^2(\Omega)$ followed by a Hanzawa transformation as in Section 3.

Applying the result of subsection 6.1 and re-parameterizing the interface repeatedly, we see that (1.6) with $\gamma \equiv 0$ yields a local semiflow on $\mathcal{SM}_0$.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $p > n+2$. Suppose $\gamma \equiv 0$, $\sigma \in C^4(0, u_c)$, and the assumptions of* (1.5) *hold true.*

Then problem (1.6) generates a local semiflow on the state manifold $\mathcal{SM}_0$. Each solution (u, Γ) exists on a maximal time interval $[0, t_*)$, where $t_* = t_*(u_0, \Gamma_0)$.

6.4. **Global Existence and Convergence.** In addition to the obstructions to global existence for the Stefan problem with variable surface tension in the presence of kinetic undercooling there is an additional possibility for loss of well-posedeness:

- *regularity*: the norms of $u(t)$ or $\Gamma(t)$ become unbounded;
- *well-posedness*: the temperature may reach 0 or u_c; or
  $T_\Gamma(u_\Gamma)$ may become non-invertible;
- *geometry*: the topology of the interface changes;
  or the interface touches the boundary of Ω;
  or the interface contracts to a point.

We set $\mathcal{E}_0 = \mathcal{SM}_0 \cap \mathcal{E}$. As in Section 5, combining the semiflow for (1.6) with the Lyapunov functional and compactness we obtain the following result.

Theorem 6.3. *Let $p > n+2$. Suppose $\gamma \equiv 0$, $\sigma \in C^4(0, u_c)$, and the assumptions of* (1.5) *hold true. Suppose that (u, Γ) is a solution of (1.6) in the state manifold $\mathcal{SM}_0$ on its maximal time interval $[0, t_*)$. Assume the following on $[0, t_*)$: there is a constant $M > 0$ such that*

(i) $|u(t)|_{W^{2-2/p}_p} + |\Gamma(t)|_{W^{3-3/p}_p} \le M < \infty$;

(ii) $0 < 1/M \le u(t)) \le u_c - 1/M$;

(iii) $|\mu_j(t)| \ge 1/M$ *holds for the eigenvalues of* $T_{\Gamma(t)}(u_\Gamma)$;

(iv) $\Gamma(t)$ *satisfies a uniform ball condition.*

Then $t_* = \infty$, i.e. the solution exists globally, and it converges in $\mathcal{SM}_0$ to an equilibrium $(u_\infty, \Gamma_\infty) \in \mathcal{E}_0$. Conversely, if $(u(t), \Gamma(t))$ is a global solution in $\mathcal{SM}_0$ which converges to an equilibrium $(u_\infty, \Gamma_\infty) \in \mathcal{E}_0$ in $\mathcal{SM}_0$ as $t \to \infty$, then the properties (i)-(iv) are valid.

Proof. The proof follows the same lines as that of Theorem 5.4. □

Acknowledgment: J.P. and M.W. express their thanks for hospitality to the Department of Mathematics at Vanderbilt University, where important parts of this work originated.

References

[1] D.M. Anderson, P. Cermelli, E. Fried, M.E. Gurtin, G.B. McFadden, General dynamical sharp-interface conditions for phase transformations in viscous heat-conducting fluids. *J. Fluid Mech.* **581** (2007), 323–370.

[2] K.S. Das, C.A. Ward, Surface thermal capacity and its effect on the boundary conditions of flud-fluid interfaces. *Physical Reviews E* **75** 065303 (2007)

[3] R. Denk, M. Hieber, and J. Prüss, *$\mathcal{R}$-boundedness, Fourier multipliers, and problems of elliptic and parabolic type*, AMS Memoirs 788, Providence, R.I. (2003).

[4] R. Denk, J. Prüss, R. Zacher, Maximal L_p-regularity of parabolic problems with boundary conditions of relaxation type. *J. Funct. Anal.* **255** (2008), 3149–3187.

[5] J. Escher, J. Prüss, G. Simonett, Analytic solutions for a Stefan problem with Gibbs-Thomson correction. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **563** (2003), 1–52.

[6] M.E. Gurtin, On the two phase problem with interfacial energy and entropy. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **96** (1986), 199–241.
[7] M.E. Gurtin, Multiphase thermomechanics with interfacial structure. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **104** (1988), 195–221.
[8] E. Hanzawa, Classical solutions of the Stefan problem. *Tôhoku Math. J. (2)* **33** (1981), 297–335.
[9] M. Ishii, H. Takashi, *Thermo-fluid dynamics of two-phase flow.* Springer, New York, 2006.
[10] M. Köhne, J. Prüss, M. Wilke, On quasilinear evolution equations in weighted L_p-spaces. *J. Evol. Eqns.* **10** (2010), 443–463.
[11] M. Köhne, J. Prüss, M. Wilke, Qualitative behaviour of solutions for the two-phase Navier-Stokes equations with surface tension. *Math. Annalen.* To appear 2011.
[12] U.F. Mayer, G. Simonett, Classical solutions for diffusion-induced grain-boundary motion. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **234** (1999), 660–674.
[13] M. Meyries, *Maximal regularity in weighted spaces, nonlinear boundary conditions, and global attractors.* PhD thesis, University of Karlsruhe, Germany, 2010.
[14] J. Prüss, Maximal regularity for evolution equations in L_p-spacess. *Conf. Sem. Mat. Univ. Bari* **285** (2003), 1–39.
[15] J. Prüss, G. Simonett, Maximal regularity for evolution equations in weighted L_p-spaces. *Archiv Math.* **82** (2004), 415–431.
[16] J. Prüss, G. Simonett, Stability of equilibria for the Stefan problem with surface tension. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **40** (2008), 675–698.
[17] J. Prüss, G. Simonett, R. Zacher, Convergence of solutions to equilibria for nonlinear parabolic problems. *J. Diff. Equations* **246** (2009), 3902–3931.
[18] J. Prüss, G. Simonett, R. Zacher, Qualitative behavior of solutions for thermodynamically consistent Stefan problems with surface tension. *arXiv:1101.3763.* Submitted.

Institut für Mathematik, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, D-60120 Halle, Germany
E-mail address: `jan.pruess@mathematik.uni-halle.de`

Department of Mathematics, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37240, USA
E-mail address: `gieri.simonett@vanderbilt.edu`

Institut für Mathematik, Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg, D-60120 Halle, Germany
E-mail address: `mathias.wilke@mathematik.uni-halle.de`